

**MINUTES**  
**Steep Parish Council**  
**Planning Committee Meeting**  
**Monday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 7.00pm**

**Present:** Cllrs. Alison Driver (Chair), Charlotte Duthie, Freddie Holmes, Shannon Askew, Paul Garstin

**Also present:** Dawn Rodgers, Clerk  
5 member of the public (MoP)

- | <b>Minute</b> | <b>Item</b>  |
|---------------|--|
| 23/19         | <b>Apologies for Absence:</b><br>None.   |
| 23/20         | <b>Approval of Minutes:</b><br><b>Resolved:</b> The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting on 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2023 were approved as an accurate record.   |
| 23/21         | <b>Declarations of Interest:</b><br>None   |
| 23/22         | <b>Public Comment:</b><br>MoP 1 expressed a concern about the Ashford Farm planning application about the impact on the landscape when viewed from the Hangers. They also suggested that new house proposed at the Cricketers<br><br>MoP 2 asked why the Brickyards application suggested new parking areas, when containers have been placed on the existing containers. They believe that the site has intensified since planning was given and this would affect the tranquility of the neighbours. They also asked why planning enforcement had not taken any action on the containers being illegally parked within the parking spaces.<br><br>MoP 3 explained why there was a need for a further barn at Ashford Farm.<br><br><b>PLANNING:</b><br>Current applications were discussed, and the following comments agreed:<br><br>23/24 <b>SDNP/23/01575/FUL</b><br><b>Ashford Farm Ashford Lane Steep Petersfield Hampshire GU32 1AA</b><br><br>The Parish Council has no objection to the application upon the following conditions:<br><br>No external lighting to be granted, to confirm to the Dark Skies TAN.<br><br>Provision for the increased water run-off to be dealt with appropriately. A concern has been raised to the council that the barn currently drains via an open ditch into Ashford Lane, and then into the road drains leading down to Ashford Stream which is a concern for contamination.<br><br>That the barn is granted only for agricultural use, both now and in the future.<br><br>23/25 <b>SDNP/23/01778/CND</b><br><b>Brickyards Industrial Estate Rockpits Lane Steep Marsh Petersfield Hampshire GU32 2BN</b><br><br>The Parish Council strongly objects to the planning application on the following basis:<br>1. The applicant has repeatedly shown a blatant disregard for planning conditions since the 2012 application was granted, being restriction on time of operation (condition 6), type of operation, turning loading unloading and parking (condition 8), and parking (condition 9). Adding insult to injury is storage containers being used on site even though storage containers constitute development and require planning permission.<br>2. The applicant is aware he has been in breach of planning in numerous ways , and yet has continued with utter |

disregard to neighbours, impact on biodiversity, traffic in the rural area and planning law. Residents, district councillors and the parish council have complained but no enforcement action has been taken.

3. The planning statement says 4 of the 6 containers have been on site since pre-10 August 2012. However, these were not picked up by planning officers in site visits during the 2012 application, either before planning was granted or after when conditions were being checked as fulfilled in 2013. Why is that if the containers were in situ at those times? Why did planning officers not record them or start enforcement at that time?

4. The applicant stated parking would be made available for 9 cars in a specific location and clearly never has – in breach of planning conditions since the outset with no intent to follow planning conditions or planning law. There are no documents relating to conditions 6 to 9 on the planning portal. Why did the planning authority not request to see proof that conditions 6 to 9 were fulfilled before development commenced?

5. If the applicant has been in breach of the conditions since outset, surely breach of condition overrides the containers being 10 years in situ rule as argued in the planning statement?

6. Condition 8 of the planning conditions re turning and loading have been breached due bin lorries (which are not overly large) not being able to go to site in normal operating hours to pick up bins due to access issues.

7. 9 parking spaces were granted in the applicants 2012 application. However, google earth images (included in the planning statement) clearly show over 20 vehicles parked at the location, none of which are in permitted locations, obviously contributing and being the reason for the breach of condition 8. Twenty vehicles are well in excess to the stated need (double the need calculated for industrial type and size of unit) and completely against the evidence used to grant permission in 2012 which stated minimal increase in vehicular movements. It then stands to reason the units are not being used as starter units as defined in the 2012 application.

8. The noise assessment referred to in the Planning Design and Access Statement says “Overall, having undertaken objective and subjective assessments of noise impacts, SAL concludes that the proposal to pick up equipment and clothing from DGG’s unit before 0700 hours would result in no or low impacts at the nearest residential property to the Site.” Impact of double the number of cars allowed to park on site would definitely have an impact, both on noise levels and on the traffic in this rural hamlet. However, no mention is made of excessive vehicles at the site, or the illegal containers plus said excessive vehicle parking causing access issues for the bin lorries. The noise assessment should refer to, for whatever reason, the bin lorry is accessing the site at 4.30am and is unable to drive forward, causing it to use its reverse beeping alarm which is disturbing the tranquil nature of the rural area. This should be addressed by the applicant.

9. If the need is 9 vehicles for the units (as stated on the planning statement), why is the applicant asking for 11 spaces?

10. The original planning permission granted in 2012 stated that “failure to comply with any conditions may invalidate the permission”. As noted above, numerous conditions (not just condition 9) have been consistently breached since outset.

The Parish Council would therefore like to see:

- a) Request for removal of condition 9 denied.
- b) Breach of condition 8 investigated.
- c) Continued breach of condition 6 rectified.
- d) All containers removed from site with immediate effect. No planning permission has been sought for them and if they were in situ in 2012 (not proven as not noticed by planning officers), they should have been removed to comply with condition 9.
- e) Parking spaces reinstated in the location as per original plans and conditions.
- f) A separate planning application for two further parking spaces is then submitted by the applicant to be reviewed on its own merits.

23/26

**SDNP/23/01017/FUL**

**Land to The North of The Cricketers Inn Church Road Steep Petersfield Hampshire GU32 2DW**

The Parish Council appreciates the extra day given to agree our consultee comments. These comments are as follows:

1. The Highways reports states that this property already benefits from a vehicular crossover arrangement (dropped kerb). This is not the case. The dropped kerb was previously a wide bell mouth junction that served the pub. Due to downhill nature of the left hand turn into the pub from the highway, we believe the removal of the wide bell mouth junction constitutes a danger to both pedestrian and vehicles accessing both the house and the pub as well as those other users of the road.

2. The planning application states the hedge will be native species, as does the Ecosystems Services Statement. However, the newly planted pub boundary hedge appears to be laurel, and thus not native species.
3. The design of the house is not in keeping with the houses in this area, offering a ‘cookie cutter’ appearance. We would request that the building materials and appearance of the windows and should match that of the older Arts and Craft nature of the existing pub to help the house blend into its surroundings.
4. The Highways report states the search was carried out using the following criteria: ‘Land use ‘Hotel, Food and Drink – Public House (Without Restaurant). The pub serves breakfast, lunch and dinner to all customers in addition to those staying overnight, including in outdoor spaces. There is also the ability to reserve a table for dining online. The pub is aiming for a high end dining experience, and therefore this should be reflected in the survey. The need for staff parking spaces is also not taken into consideration in the report, changing the figures significantly
5. The Highways report also states: “The sale of the plot resulted in the loss of around seven car parking spaces. Clearly there has been no issue with The Cricketers Inn parking capacity prior to or following the annexing of the land.” This cannot be proven, as the pub did not open until Friday 19th May after being closed on the 13th February. The land was annexed prior to the pub opening. The Parish Council have spoken to staff in the pub, and were informed they have been asked by pub management to park in Church Road NOT the pub carpark due to concerns for capacity. It is likely that every member of staff will have a car in this semi-rural part of the village as bus services only run once a day in either direction. Parking on Church Road is already an issue, and this will compound matters unacceptably. The 7 lost carparking spaces could have been staff carparking.
6. The application form states there will be no loss in “existing vehicle/cycle parking spaces” and has answered ‘no’ to “will the proposed development add/remove any parking spaces?” This is incorrect.
7. The application form states the existing use is garden. However, it is garden and pub parking.
8. There is no provision for visitor parking in the new build property. Visitors would either have to park in the pub, adversely affecting trade or park on nearby Church Road, further exacerbating the parking issues for Church Road residents as mentioned above.
9. Eco systems – there is nothing in the application showing any net gain increase in biodiversity, especially as a large part of this development was previously garden space. Also, half the native hedgerow that bordered the road was removed in nesting season.
10. When viewing the plot from the road, there appears to be an oil tank in the far left corner of the plot (although visibility from the road was difficult). Does this currently serve the pub? If so, where is it being relocated? This appears to be currently located in part of the site (accordingly to the site plan) for the new build garden.

Due to parking issues above, before planning is approved, we request the applicant provide a parking plan clearly evaluating the following: how many staff parking places are required (bearing in mind no public transport at this location), how many parking spaces are required for pub customers based on maximum capacity table covers and casual pub users (inside and out), how many spaces are required by accommodation customers at full capacity, as well as the impact of residents of the new build using the pub for visitor carparking. It should be demonstrated that users and residents of Church Road are not adversely affected.

23/27

DATE OF NEXT MEETING – To be arranged

The meeting closed at 7.43 p.m.