



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in The Assembly Room at The Council House (Chichester City Council) North Street Chichester on Friday 17 June 2016 at 09:30

**Members Present**

Mr R Hayes (Chairman), Mrs C Purnell (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mr M Cullen, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J F Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mr L Hixson, Mrs J Kilby, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr R Plowman, Mrs J Tassell and Mrs P Tull

**Members Absent**

**Officers Present**

Miss C Boddy (Senior Planning Officer), Mr J Bushell (Principal Planning Officer), Mr S Carvell (Executive Director), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Mr J Saunders (Development Manager (National Park)), Mr G Thrussell (Senior Member Services Officer), Mr T Townsend (West Sussex County Council Senior Planner Strategic Planning) and Mr T Whitty (Development Management Service Manager)

**13 Chairman's Announcements**

*In Memory of Jo Cox MP*

Mr Hayes commenced the meeting by asking everyone to observe with him a one-minute silence in memory of Jo Cox, the Labour MP for Batley and Spen in West Yorkshire, who had been murdered the previous day, Thursday 16 June 2016, while she was performing constituency duties in Birstall. Those who were able to do so stood for the silence.

*Miscellaneous Matters*

Mr Hayes welcomed everyone to this meeting, which (as stated on the front page of the agenda) was not being held in the usual venue at Chichester District Council's (CDC) headquarters in East Pallant House but at Chichester City Council's (CCC) Assembly Room in the Council House North Street Chichester. This was on account of the committee rooms at East Pallant House being required for the EU referendum on Thursday 23 June 2016.

Mr Hayes explained the CCC emergency evacuation procedure and acknowledged the presence of the CDC officers and the West Sussex County Council officer who

were present at the start of this meeting. Other CDC development management officers would be present later in the meeting for specific agenda items.

The meeting was being observed by Chloe Barber, a secondary school work experience student who had been spending the week with CDC's Member Services team.

#### *Apologies for Absence*

There were no apologies for absence and every member of the Planning Committee was present at the start of this meeting.

#### *Items Deferred or Withdrawn*

There were no agenda items which had been deferred or withdrawn.

### 14 **Approval of Minutes**

The Planning Committee received the minutes of its previous meeting on Wednesday 25 May 2016.

Mr Oakley proposed the following two amendments to page [PC 25.05.16 4]:

- In the thirteenth line of the third para replace 'disused canal' with 'adjacent watercourse'
- In the final para (recording the decision) delete the words 'and surface water'

The Planning Committee supported making both of those amendments.

There were no other proposed changes to the minutes.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Planning Committee approves without amendment the minutes of its meeting on Wednesday 25 May 2016.

Mr Hayes signed and dated the final page ([PC 25.05.16 8]) of the official version of the minutes.

### 15 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent matters for consideration under agenda item 15 b) (Late Items).

### 16 **Declarations of Interests**

The obligation to make declarations of interests related to agenda items 5 to 13 inclusive.

### *A – Disclosable Pecuniary Interests*

Disclosable pecuniary interests have been introduced by section 30 of the *Localism Act 2011* and are set out in paras 3 to 7 of Part 3 of CDC's *Code of Conduct* adopted on Tuesday 9 October 2012. They are interests that either the member has or is aware that his or her partner has. Where such an interest exists the member concerned must declare it. Unless the member has previously received a dispensation to do so from the Monitoring Officer, he or she may not participate in any discussion of or in any vote taken on that item of business. The member concerned must move to the public seating area for the duration of the item of business in question and from that area he or she may make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to that item of business, provided that he or she has received a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer to do so.

There were no declarations of a disclosable pecuniary interest made at this meeting.

### *B - Personal Interests*

Personal interests are defined in paras 8 and 9 of Part 4 of CDC's *Code of Conduct* adopted on Tuesday 9 October 2012. They include (as set out on pages 1 and 2 of the agenda for this meeting) membership of parish councils, West Sussex County Council, outside organisations or public bodies where those local authorities, organisations or bodies have been consulted in respect of a planning application or another relevant agenda item.

Miss Golding explained that the personal interests set out on pages 1 and 2 of the agenda were to be taken as having been declared by the member concerned in respect of the relevant planning applications in agenda items 5 to 13 inclusive where such consultations had taken place.

There were seven members of the Planning Committee who made the following declarations of personal interests:

Mr Barrett declared a personal interest in respect of planning application CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5) as a Chichester District Council appointed member of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy.

Mrs Duncton declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5), SB/16/00205/OUT (agenda item 8), WE/16/01078/COU (agenda item 11), SDNP/15/06142/FUL (agenda item 12) (also the subject of the prejudicial interest recorded below) and SDNP/15/06493/FUL (agenda item 13) as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Mr Hayes declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications SB/16/00205/OUT (agenda item 8) (also the subject of the prejudicial interest recorded below) and SB/16/01092/FUL (agenda item 9) as a member of Southbourne Parish Council.

Mrs Kilby declared a personal interest in respect of planning application CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5) as a member of Chichester City Council.

Mr McAra declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5), SB/16/00205/OUT (agenda item 8), WE/16/01078/COU (agenda item 11), SDNP/15/06142/FUL (agenda item 12) and SDNP/15/06493/FUL (agenda item 13) as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5), SB/16/00205/OUT (agenda item 8), WE/16/01078/COU (agenda item 11), SDNP/15/06142/FUL (agenda item 12) and SDNP/15/06493/FUL (agenda item 13) as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Mr Plowman declared a personal interest in respect of planning application CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5) as a member of Chichester City Council.

### *C - Prejudicial Interests*

A personal interest which is also a prejudicial interest is defined in para 12 of Part 4 of CDC's *Code of Conduct* adopted on Tuesday 9 October 2012.

Where a member has a prejudicial interest he or she must declare it and move to the public seating area for the duration of the relevant item. That member may not participate in any discussion of or vote taken on that item. The member is entitled, however, to make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to that item of business on the basis that the public is allowed to attend the meeting for that same purpose.

There were three declarations of a prejudicial interest made at this meeting as follows:

Mrs Duncton declared a prejudicial interest in respect of planning application SDNP/15/06142/FUL (agenda item 12) as the West Sussex County Council Deputy Cabinet Member for Resident Services, which section had responsibility for the maintenance of Burton Mill Pond.

Mr Hayes declared a prejudicial interest in respect of planning application SB/16/00205/OUT (agenda item 8) as his house was in close proximity to the application site.

Mr Hixson declared a prejudicial interest in respect of planning application CC/15/04163/FUL (agenda item 5) as his house was in close proximity to the application site.

### *D – Pre-Determination or Bias*

The concept of pre-determination or bias is explained in para 14 of Part 4 of CDC's *Code of Conduct* adopted on Tuesday 9 October 2012.

A member should not be prohibited from participating in a decision in his or her political role as a member on account of having been involved in campaigning in his or her political role on an issue which does not impact on his or her personal and/or professional life. However a member should not place himself or herself under any

financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations who or that might seek to influence that member in the performance of his or her official duties. A member must retain the ability to consider the matter with an open mind and to give proper consideration to all the facts and information relevant to the decision.

Furthermore, when making a decision a member should consider the matter with an open mind and on the facts at the meeting at which the decision is to be taken. There were no declarations of predetermination or bias made at this meeting.

### *E – Non-Participation for Other Reasons*

Sometimes members decide not to participate in the discussion of and decision on a particular agenda item for a reason other than in *A* to *D* above. Where this is the case the details are set out below.

There were no declarations made at this meeting not to participate for other reasons.

### **Planning Applications**

As previously stated by the chairman, no items had been deferred or withdrawn from the agenda.

The Planning Committee considered in turn each of the reports for the planning applications listed in the agenda and the agenda update sheet which had been published in the late afternoon of the previous day and circulated immediately prior to the start of this meeting (copies attached to the official minutes). The agenda update sheet summarised the observations and amendments which had arisen since the despatch of the agenda.

Officers provided oral updates to the agenda update sheet where appropriate.

During the presentations by officers of the applications, and as indicated with greater particularity below, members viewed photographs, plans, drawings, computerised images and artist impressions which were displayed on the screens or, where permitted by the chairman, shown or circulated by speakers.

### **RESOLVED**

That the Planning Committee makes the following decisions in respect of agenda items 5 to 13 inclusive (minute paras 17 to 25 respectively) subject to the stated observations and amendments.

[**Note** Minute paras 17 to 25 below summarise how each planning application was considered but for full details please refer to the audio recording facility via this link: <http://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=134&MId=731&Ver=4>]

17 **CC/15/04163/FUL - Land Adjacent to Tesco Petrol Filling Station Fishbourne Road East Chichester West Sussex**

[**Note** Immediately prior to the start of this item Mr Hixson withdrew from the committee table in accordance with his earlier declaration of a prejudicial interest and he did not participate in the Planning Committee's debate of or decision on this application]

Mr Bushell presented this planning application for a proposed fully managed student accommodation block comprising two buildings each three to four storeys with 134 student bed spaces, associated access works and landscaping. This application was supported by the University of Chichester to accommodate the recent increase in the student population. The supporting text to Policy 33 (New Residential Development) in the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029* referred to a specific requirement for student housing and this site was identified for new student accommodation in the draft *Chichester Site Allocation Development Plan Document*.

Mr Bushell explained the proposal with reference to slides shown on the screens consisting of (a) an aerial photograph (features, constraints, facilities identified); (b) photographs (various views); (c) site plan (details of proposed arrangement of two buildings, prohibition on student cars and on-site supervision); (d) floor plan (details explained); (e) elevation drawings (details explained with samples of real wood laminate circulated to members for inspection); (f) colour 3D images of how development might appear (provided by applicant); and (g) colour 3D image of original proposal for 153 students and four- to five-storeys (provided by applicant).

Mr Bushell drew attention to the agenda update sheet which reported (a) Chichester City Council's comments on the substitute plans and objecting to the proposal and (b) a total of 20 third party objectors to the substitute plans.

The following members of the public addressed the Planning Committee on this item:

- (a) Mrs J Hixson (Chairman of Dolphin Mews Residents Association) – objector
- (b) Mr L Hixson – objector
- (c) Mrs A Greenwood – objector
- (d) Mr J Snell – supporter
- (e) Mr J Gillespie (Gilltown Planning) – agent for the applicant

Mrs C M M Apel addressed the Planning Committee as one of the two CDC members for the Chichester West ward. She expressed a number of concerns about the proposal.

The debate began with comments by the local ward member on the need for student accommodation, the design and mass of the two buildings and the use of materials.

Members expressed various views for and against the development, which included:

- (a) The principle of student accommodation on this site with a range of facilities (as set out in para 3.1 of the report) was acceptable.
- (b) The proposed accommodation was a welcome means of reducing the number of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) in the city, which had in certain areas created difficulties for local residents. The contrary view, however, was that this would not necessarily avoid students wishing to live in HMOs in the city because HMOs would be nearer to the university campus and the city's facilities and perhaps less expensive than this student accommodation. The location being so far from facilities was unacceptable.
- (c) The bulk and mass of the buildings at a strategic location entrance to this cathedral city and *vis-à-vis* Fishbourne Road East were not appropriate.
- (d) The suitability of using real wood laminate. Despite having viewed the samples circulated at this meeting, concern was expressed in particular about the laminate cladding in view of some anecdotal evidence that over time it peeled off buildings. There was interest in whether a rendered or brick (or another permanent) finish was preferable; the former would be easier to paint when it had deteriorated.
- (e) The absence of any amenity space on the site for students to use. It would be desirable for a reconfiguration to allow this to be included.
- (f) The lack of an on-site amenity space and the intensity of student numbers within the buildings posed a noise disturbance risk.
- (g) The ability to enforce the total prohibition on students bringing cars into the city.
- (h) The desirability of having a full-time, continuous resident manager in the buildings during term time to deal not only with issues such as student noise but also to be available to provide them with care and assistance. This ought to feature in the section 106 agreement.

Mr Bushell, Mr Townsend (West Sussex County Council Highways (WSCCH)), Mr Whitty and Mr Carvell responded to members' questions and comments on points of detail which included:

- The capacity of Apuldram wastewater treatment works to cope with this development. There was sufficient capacity. Offsite infrastructure would need to be upgraded.
- The impact of the development on views of the cathedral. Para 8.8 of the report stated that there would be no harmful impact on those views.
- The number of proposed parking spaces (eight), whether this was sufficient for ancillary staff, mini-buses and disabled persons and whether there was a

problem with displacement of student car parking at the University of Chichester student accommodation at the former High School for Girls site in Stockbridge Road Chichester. WSCCH had undertaken an evidence-led assessment over several months. The applicant proposed (based on research) two car parking spaces for mobility-impaired people. This satisfied the WSCCH parking provision requirement but there would be no objection by WSCCH to a higher allocation because the take-up of the eight spaces was likely to be very low. There would be ample space for on-site deliveries. There was unlikely to be much traffic generation because of the nature of the development. WSCCH had spent considerable time monitoring the parking situation at the former High School for Girls site and it was working satisfactorily. The detailed transport assessment did not give rise to any concerns by WSCCH about this development.

- The absence of an on-site amenity space. There would be none as part of this development. The buildings would take up a significant part of the site. There were amenity facilities in the city's parks and on the campus site itself. The recreational space was appropriate for this type of accommodation.
- The height of the buildings, which had been questioned by some objectors. Its maximum height was confirmed as 14.5m at the rear of the site and 13m relative to the level of Fishbourne Road East at the south west corner of the site where it was to be set down into the ground.
- The University of Chichester was keen to ensure effective management. A student accommodation management plan was integral and would be included within the section 106 agreement and there would be a student tenancy agreement. Noise from students would be addressed by the on-site presence of paid, mature post-graduate students who would deal with anti-social behaviour issues quickly and effectively.
- The building of this development would not in itself resolve the issue of the city's HMOs but it would constitute an attractive alternative for students.
- The durability of the real wood laminate cladding. The material was a modern, novel and very advanced product; it was ultra violet resilient; it had a crisp, bold appearance; individual panels could subsequently be replaced. Condition 2 (schedule of proposed materials) would permit an alternative material being used and this aspect could be considered further in the light of members' concerns. In the case of large buildings the use of rendering could make them appear large and bulky; it was for this reason that officers had not recommended a rendered finish. The use of an alternative material such as brick would not require a complete redesign.
- The provision of broadband. This was almost if not actually a foregone conclusion but a condition would be included to address this issue.

At the end of the debate Mr Carvell took note of members' views regarding the external cladding material and the 24-hour presence of a resident manager in the buildings during term time. He confirmed that (a) the issue of the discharge of the



materials condition would be brought back to the Planning Committee for determination and (b) officers would explore with the applicant the issue of a 24-hour management presence in the buildings during term time.

The Planning Committee (without Mr Hixson's participation) voted with a show of hands by a majority of seven to six against with one abstention in favour of the recommendation and on the basis of (a) and (b) in the immediately foregoing para.

*Decision*

Recommendation to **defer** for **section 106 agreement** then **permit** and **on the basis that** (a) the issue of the **discharge of condition 2** (schedule of proposed materials) would be **brought back** to the **Planning Committee** for **determination** and (b) **officers** would **explore** with the **applicant** the **issue of a 24-hour management presence in the buildings during term time** agreed.

[**Note** At the end of this item Mr Hixson returned to the committee table]

[**Note** At the end of this item there was a short adjournment between 10:51 and 11:00]

18 **CH/16/00296/FUL - The Kabin Main Road Bosham West Sussex PO18 8PN**

Mr Whitty introduced this planning application for a replacement dwelling with reference to a series of slides shown on the screens namely (a) application site plans; (b) colour site plan (present); (c) photographs of current dwelling house; (d) colour site plan (proposed); and (d) elevation drawings (present and proposed).

The agenda update sheet supplied additional planning history for section 4 on page 21.

No members of the public addressed the Planning Committee in respect of this item.

In reply to a member's question Mr Whitty said that one parking space for a one-bedroom dwelling was correct.

The Planning Committee voted unanimously on a show of hands by 15 votes in favour and none against and with no abstentions to approve the application.

*Decision*

Recommendation to **permit** agreed.

19 **FB/15/03629/TPA - Land West of 22 Salthill Road Fishbourne West Sussex**

Mr Whitty introduced this planning application to fell to ground level one no Oak tree (T1) subject to FB/79/00053/TPO with reference to a set of slides shown on the screens as follows: (a) aerial photograph (tree identified); (b) close-up aerial photograph; and (c) photographs of the tree and its relationship to the small

extension to the bungalow on the site. He summarised the main issues set out in paras 8.1 to 8.9 of the report.

The agenda update sheet corrected the planning application reference in the first sentence of para 3.1 of the agenda report.

No members of the public addressed the Planning Committee in respect of this item.

In reply to members' questions Mr Whitty explained (a) why there would be the potential for a compensation claim as a result of a refusal to permit the felling of the tree and (b) that there was no record of the planning permission to build the extension in the late 1980s.

There was a clear consensus in favour of the retention of the tree.

The Planning Committee voted unanimously on a show of hands by 15 votes in favour and none against and with no abstentions to refuse the application.

#### *Decision*

Recommendation to **refuse** agreed.

#### 20 **SB/16/00205/OUT - Dunkirk South Lane Southbourne Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8PR**

[**Note** Immediately prior to the start of this application Mr Hayes withdrew from the committee table and moved to the public seating area in accordance with his earlier declaration of a prejudicial interest in respect of this item and Mrs Purnell took his place in order to chair the proceedings]

Mr Whitty introduced this outline planning application with all matters reserved for the erection of five no dwellings and associated works. In so doing he drew attention to a sequence of slides displayed on the screens namely (a) a map of Southbourne extracted from the recently made Southbourne neighbourhood development plan (NDP); (b) a close-up map of the site and the surrounding roads; (c) an aerial photograph (features identified); (d) a site location plan with settlement boundary shown; (e) an aerial photograph (site context); (f) an indicative colour site plan; (g) indicative elevation drawings and materials; and (h) photographs (various views).

The agenda update sheet amended (a) condition 5 (surface water) and (b) the recommendation to one of defer for section 106 agreement then permit.

The following members of the public addressed the Planning Committee on this item:

- (a) Mr R Gowlett (Southbourne Parish Council) – parish representative in objection
- (b) Mrs S Talbot – objector

(c) Mr R Hayes – objector

(d) Mrs K Simmons (Genesis Town Planning) – agent for the applicant

During the discussion members expressed views for and against the application and they raised various points, which included the following:

- (a) An extra condition for the protection of wildlife (in particular slow worms) was required.
- (b) The apparent mistake in the now made Southbourne NDP, which had gone unnoticed throughout the NDP process, whereby the site to the north of the railway line had inadvertently been included within the settlement boundary line and so was supported for development by Policy 1. Some members thought that whilst this was an unfortunate oversight, it could not influence the determination of this planning application, which had to be made in accordance with the relevant planning policies and principles. Other members were exercised by the dilemma to which this situation had given rise, namely whether the NDP policy text or the actual intentions in preparing the NDP to restrict development to the south of the settlement boundary should prevail.

Mr Whitty and Miss Golding advised with respect to members' concerns in (b). Whilst Southbourne Parish Council's (SPC) frustration over the error in the plan was understood, para 8.2 of the agenda report explained the planning policy justification in both the Southbourne NDP (including Policy 1 (Development within the Settlement Boundaries) which was read out by Mr Whitty) and the *Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2104-2029* for establishing the principle of development. Notwithstanding the evolution of the NDP maps, the final version of the Southbourne NDP was now part of the Development Plan and this was what now had to be interpreted and applied. It was not the Planning Committee's function to look into the asserted mistake in the NDP, in respect of which in any event it did not have all the relevant evidence. Insofar as the NDP plan was concerned, the settlement boundary position was very clear and *prima facie* not a mistake. It was for SPC to seek a review of the NDP. It would be unreasonable for the Planning Committee (as had been suggested) to defer this application until SPC had decided whether to seek such a review. It was incumbent on members to determine the application now having regard to the relevant facts and material planning considerations presented to the meeting.

At the end of the debate the Planning Committee voted on a show of hands with regard to the officer recommendation and there was a tied outcome: seven votes in favour and seven against, with no abstentions (Mr Hayes was not participating in this decision by virtue of his prejudicial interest). Mrs Purnell then exercised her casting vote in accordance with her original vote namely in support of the application. The application was, therefore, approved by eight votes to seven votes with no abstentions.

*Decision*

Recommendation to **defer** for a **section 106 agreement** then **permit** with **amended condition 5** (surface water) and **extra condition 15** (wildlife) agreed.

[**Note** At the end of this application Mrs Purnell vacated the chairman's position at the table and Mr Hayes returned thereto in order to chair the rest of the meeting]

[**Note** At the end of this item at 12:08 Mr Plowman left the meeting on account of other engagements and did not return for the remainder of the meeting]

21 **SB/16/01092/FUL - 5 Salterns Reach Prinsted Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8FQ**

Mr Whitty introduced this outline planning application for a variation of condition 2 of planning permission SB/15/02260/FUL to allow minor amendments to the planning permission by way of a conservation rooflights to the rear elevation and use of the roof space for storage and lifestyle/home office space. He referred to a series of slides shown on the screens: (a) location plan; (b) drawings of the permitted and proposed rooflights; and (c) photographs.

There were no items in the agenda update sheet for this item.

One member of the public addressed the Planning Committee regarding this item:

(a) Mr D Harris – agent for the applicant

There was no discussion by the Planning Committee about this item.

The Planning Committee voted in favour of this application on a show of hands by 13 votes with none against and no abstentions (Mrs Tassell had left the meeting during this item did not return until just after the start of the application in minute para 23 below).

*Decision*

Recommendation to **permit** agreed.

22 **SI/16/01058/FUL - 83 Fletchers Lane Sidlesham West Sussex PO20 7QG**

[**Note** Mrs Tassell was not present for this item having left the meeting during the previous item; she did not return until the next agenda item (minute para 23)]

Miss Boddy presented this planning application for a change of use from agriculture to one no dwelling (C3 use class) and erection of pitched roof over building, alternative to part 3, class Q prior approval SI/15/03438/PA3Q. In explaining the proposal she drew attention to a set of slides shown on the screens consisting of (a) a location plan; (b) a plan of the extant building; (c) the prior approval application plan; (d) a drawing of the proposed building; and (e) photographs (various views).

Para 8.8 of the agenda report stated that permitted development rights would be removed.

The agenda update sheet reported the receipt of substitute plans.

No members of the public wished to address the Planning Committee on this item.

Miss Boddy replied to members' questions on points of detail about the curtilage/boundary treatment (conditions 4 and 12) and removal of permitted development rights (conditions 8, 10 and 11).

The Planning Committee voted in favour of this application on a show of hands by nine votes to three against and one abstention (Mrs Tassell had left the meeting during the previous item (minute para 21) and did not return until just after the start of the application in minute para 23 below).

#### *Decision*

Recommendation to **permit** agreed.

### 23 **WE/16/01078/COU - Land West of the Old Army Camp Cemetery Lane Woodmancote Westbourne West Sussex**

[**Note** Mrs Tassell returned to the meeting shortly after the start of the case officer's initial presentation (next para)]

Miss Boddy presented this planning application for a change of use of land to a private gypsy and traveller caravan site consisting of one no mobile home, one no utility building, one no touring caravan and associated works. She referred to a sequence of slides displayed on the screens consisting of (a) a location plan; (b) a colour site plan of the extant building; (c) elevation drawings; and (d) photographs (various views to set the context including the West Sussex County Council gypsy and traveller transit site to the south of the application site).

There were no entries in the agenda update sheet for this item.

The following members of the public addressed the Planning Committee on this item:

(a) Mr R Hitchcock (Westbourne Parish Council) – parish representative in objection

(b) Mr W Green - applicant

In the course of his opening remarks as the local ward member Mr Dunn proposed a site visit by members in order to appreciate better the amount of existing development in this area and so the likely impact of the development envisaged in this application. His proposal was seconded by Mrs Tull.

Mr Oakley requested that a site visit should be used in part to consider whether the development would constitute an efficient use of land. Officers noted the suggestion.

The Planning Committee voted on a show of hands in favour of the proposal to defer the application for a member site visit by 11 votes to nil with two abstentions (one member not participating in the voting).

### *Decision*

**Defer for a site visit by members.**

24 **SDNP/15/06142/FUL - Burton Mill Pond Burton Park Road Barlavington GU28 0JR**

[**Note** Immediately prior to the start of this application Mrs Duncton withdrew from the committee table and moved to the public seating area in accordance with her earlier declaration of a prejudicial interest in respect of this item]

Mr Saunders explained this planning application for the construction of decking platform to enable disabled angling and wildlife watching and in so doing he referred to slides on the screens namely (a) an OS location plan (features identified) and an expanded version; (b) an aerial photograph and a close-up thereof; (c) plans of the decking; and (d) photographs (various views of decking, the car parking area and highway safety issues). The response by West Sussex County Council Highways (WSCCH) to safety issues was set out in para 4.2 of the report. The reasons for the officer recommendation to approve were set out in the executive summary and section 8 of the agenda report.

The agenda update sheet reported additional comments from Sutton and Barlavington Parish Council.

The following members of the public addressed the Planning Committee on this item:

(a) Mrs J Duncton (Petworth Division) – West Sussex County Council member

(b) Mr P Mills on behalf of Mrs A Mills (his mother) - objector

Mr Saunders and Mr Whitty answered members' questions on points of details with respect to (a) the purpose of the increased decking area, which was to facilitate angling by wheelchair users rather than for the use of anglers generally, although that might also happen and (b) the possible need for WSCCH to clear vegetation on the verge to improve visibility for drivers approaching the pedestrian crossing.

The Planning Committee voted on a show of hands in favour of the proposal to approve the application by 12 votes to nil with one abstention (Mrs Duncton did not participate because of her prejudicial interest).

*Decision*

Recommendation to **approve** agreed.

[**Note** At the end of this application Mrs Duncton returned to her seat at the committee table]

25 **SDNP/15/06493/FUL - Hillgrove Stud Farm London Road Northchapel West Sussex GU28 9EQ**

Mr Saunders explained this planning application for the construction of a farm house with reference to a series of slides shown on the screens namely (a) a location plan; (b) a site plan; (c) an aerial photograph; (d) photographs (various views); and (e) elevation drawings with floor plans. The reasons for the officer recommendation to approve were set out in the executive summary and section 8 of the agenda report.

There were no entries in the agenda update sheet.

The following members of the public addressed the Planning Committee for this item:

- (a) Mr P Hanauer – supporter
- (b) Mr P Pollard – agent for the applicant

In the short discussion several members expressed support for the development.

The Planning Committee voted on a show of hands in favour of the proposal to approve the application by 13 votes to nil with no abstentions (one member did not participate in the voting).

*Decision*

Recommendation to **approve** agreed.

26 **Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

The Planning Committee received and noted the schedule of planning appeals, court and policy matters circulated with the agenda (copy attached to the official minutes).

The agenda update sheet contained no entries in respect of the schedule.

A member raised one point with respect to the schedule namely Section 2 – Decisions Received SDNP/15/04270/HOUS – The Coach House Eartham Lane Eartham West Sussex PO18 0LP – page 95, querying the reason for the officers' decision not to challenge the inspector's decision to allow appeal after the Planning Inspectorate had acknowledged that the inspector had applied a wrong test.

The same member also enquired and was advised as to the status of the following matters not on the agenda for this meeting but which had appeared in the schedule of outstanding contraventions circulated with the agenda for the Planning Committee's meeting on 27 April 2016:

(1) The direct action being taken by CDC in respect of Decoy Farm Aldingbourne (O/03/00173/CONMHC) (page 278 of the aforesaid agenda).

(2) The following eight Birdham cases:

- BI/14/00270/CONADV – The Barnyard Birdham Road Birdham (page 268)
- BI/15/00139/CONSH – Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road (page 268)
- BI/15/00194/CONTRV – Plot C – Land North West of Birdham Farm Birdham Road Chichester (page 269)
- BI/15/00194/CONTRV - Plot D - Land North West of Birdham Farm Birdham Road Chichester (page 269)
- BI/15/00139/CONSH – Plot C – Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road Chichester (page 269)
- BI/15/00139/CONSH – Access and Track - Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road (page 269)
- BI/15/00139/CONSH – Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road (page 270)
- BI/15/00139/CONSH – Land North West of Premier Business Park Birdham Road (page 270)

**27 Late Items**

There were no late items for urgent consideration at this meeting.

**28 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Planning Committee did not resolve to exclude the press and public.

**[Note** The meeting ended at 13:18]

---

CHAIRMAN

---

DATE