

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Fiona Baker on 01243 534609

Email: fbaker@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Planning Committee** will be held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Wednesday 12 July 2023 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr S Johnson (Chairman), Mr J Cross (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Bates, Mr D Betts, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brookes-Harmer, Ms B Burkhart, Mrs H Burton, Mrs D Johnson, Mr H Potter, Ms S Quail, Mrs S Sharp and Mr C Todhunter

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

19 **Agenda Update Sheet 12.07.23** (Pages 1 - 3)

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee
12 July 2023

ITEM: 5

APPLICATION NO: NM/22/02191/OUT

COMMENT:

Parish Council

Members of the Planning Committee have been sent copies of a statement from North Mundham Parish Council regarding the report and the recommendation to permit which the Parish Council consider is inconsistent with the decision to refuse outline planning permission for a housing development of 30 dwellings on land at Streamside Farm, Lagness Road, Runcton.

ITEM: 8

APPLICATION NO: CC/23/00600/FUL

COMMENT:

This item is withdrawn from the agenda.

ITEM: 9

APPLICATION NO: CC/23/03201/LBC

COMMENT:

This item is withdrawn from the agenda.

ITEM: 10

APPLICATION NO: CC/21/03421/FUL

COMMENT:

This item is withdrawn from the agenda.

ITEM: 13**APPLICATION NO:** SDNP/22/02474/FUL**COMMENT:**

1 no. additional third-party representation received from The National Farmers Union on 30.06.2023

- Mrs Tupper is heavily involved in the lambing and therefore a suitable dwelling on site is extremely important.
- The conversion of the former dairy building will help to maintain the viability of the farm business and the continuation of local food production for the long-term by supporting its operation.
- This application is consistent with the SNDP Local Plan which has an objective to protect and provide for local businesses including farming, and recognises that agriculture is a crucial part of the National Parks economy
- Policy SD41 supports the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings for the most appropriate viable use, in the first instance for 'housing for essential agricultural or forestry workers or succession housing for former agricultural or forestry workers.
- The NFU supports this application for approval on the basis that our members have a clear need for a permanent dwelling.
- The proposed location of the dwelling meets the operational needs of the farm, and the development is in line with NPPF and the South Downs Local Plan.

Applicant's Supporting Information

The structural surveyor has confirmed the roof structure could support slate tiles. His report is based on an insulated profiled metal sheeting which weighs 1.3 kN/sqm, and slate would be only marginally heavier than this at 1.5 kN/sqm.

ITEM: 15**South Downs National Park Authority Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

COMMENT:

Appeal Decision SDNP/22/02406/FUL - Land adjacent to Southbrook Lodge

Appeal Decision: Dismissed

The appeal site is in a rural area away from the built up area of West Ashling, which is to the north. SD25 of the South Downs Local Plan 2014-33 (LP) establishes that development outside of settlement boundaries will only be permitted if certain criteria can be satisfied... previously developed land (PDL). PDL as land which is occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land but excluding residential gardens in built-up areas. The appeal site is a residential garden. It is close to a very small number of other dwellings in an area that cannot be characterised as built-up...The Framework is however silent on whether residential gardens within rural areas should be considered PDL... specific excluded from the PDL definition as clarified by the Dartford decision¹, it is not clear that such land should automatically be considered PDL... includes areas of lawn, planted borders, patios, outbuildings, and a swimming pool... remote area of the appeal site reads as an additional area of land that has a different appearance and association with the existing dwelling and is more akin to an adjoining meadow or paddock. even if I take the view that the appeal site should be considered PDL, I find that the sentence within the Framework glossary that 'it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed' to be highly relevant. The proposed dwelling would be a considerable distance from the existing dwelling. It would not replace an existing structure and would stand on land that has a different appearance to the primary domestic curtilage that surrounds the existing dwelling to the north of the driveway..... The appellant refers to the site as an infill proposal, between two existing dwellings. Infill development in a rural location such as this outside of an existing settlement is not a development type that is supported by the LP or the Framework other than development within a Green Belt, which the proposal would not be. This matter does not therefore weigh in favour of the proposal..... The proposed dwelling would intensify built form in the area. It would be sited parallel with the road whereby, owing to the raised ground level of the site relative to the road, it would be prominent to view when passing by the site in either direction. In such views it would be seen to connect up the existing dwellings to the north and south, and in doing so would result in a row of three dwellings parallel with the road that would lessen the area's strong rural character and appearance..... Harmful impacts would also arise from light spill at night in an area that is characterised by its dark skies..... The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including national planning policy, that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Cost Decision: Dismissed

I am satisfied that the NPA's assessment of the proposal in the context of its development plan was reasonable, and in my appeal decision I reached a similar conclusion on this main issue. Therefore, unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not warranted.

This page is intentionally left blank