

# Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in the Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Wednesday 27 March 2024 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mr C Todhunter (Chairman), Mr J Cross (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Bates, Mr D Betts, Ms B Burkhart, Mrs H Burton, Mrs D Johnson, Mr S Johnson, Mr H Potter and Ms S Quail

**Members not present:** Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brookes-Harmer and Mrs S Sharp

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present:** Mrs F Stevens (Divisional Manger for Planning), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Miss D Smith (Development Manager (Applications)), Ms S Haig (Planning Officer), Miss J Bell (Development Manager (Majors and Business)), Mr M Mew (Principal Planning Officer) and Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer)

## 190 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed all present to the meeting and read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

Apologies were received from Cllr's Briscoe, Brookes-Harmer and Sharp.

## 191 **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes for the meetings held on 7 February 2024 and 6 March 2024 would be agreed at the meeting on 17 April 2024.

## 192 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

## 193 **Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest raised.

## 194 **23/01855/FULEIA - Rolls Royce Motor Cars, The Drive, Westhampnett - REPORT TO FOLLOW**

Ms Bell presented the report, Mrs Rollings, Economic Development Officer and Mr Gledhill from West Sussex County Council Highways were also in attendance.

Ms Bell informed the Committee that following the application's deferral at the meeting of 6 March 2024 further clarification had been sought on the proposed access arrangements and detailed in bold text within the report.

Ms Bell outlined the site location and highlighted its proximity to Stane Street, the A27, the Solar Farm and the boundary of the SDNP. The site was situated within a rural area but adjacent to Westhampnett.

Ms Bell reminded the Committee the site was identified for expansion within policy A21 of the emerging Local Plan.

Ms Bell explained the application was a Hybrid application which would be delivered in two phases; Phase One being a full application and Phase 2 an Outline application. Details of proposed delivery during each phase was set out in the report (pages 3-5).

Ms Bell detailed the proposed landscaping arrangements and drew attention to Condition 19 which required 'an extra heavy standard Oak Tree' to replace the one which would need to be removed during construction.

Ms Bell went through the different access options which had been considered. All options were assessed against the four key objectives;

- No increase traffic through Maudlin
- No increase in HGV's through Maudlin
- A reduction in the number of HGV movements on Stane Street through Westhampnett
- No queuing on Stane Street and Roman Road

Of the nine scenarios modelled only Option F met the four key objectives.

Ms Bell highlighted footpath 417 which the applicant had applied to divert, this was a separate process and a decision from government would be made in due course.

Representations were received from;

Mrs Rosalind Craven – Objector  
Mr John Brown – Objector  
Mr Andrew Blanchard - Objector  
Mr Andrew Ball – Applicant

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;

Responding to concerns regarding HGVs continuing to travel through Westhampnett; Ms Bell acknowledged the concerns. However, she reminded the Committee of the current operating situation at the site, which meant all HGV movements (both entering and exiting the site) travelled along Stane Street. Whilst there would be a slight increase in HGV movement along Stane Street it would not be a substantial increase as HGVs would be entering the site from the A285. In addition, movement through Maudlin would be removed as vehicles would use the internal road.

Regarding the installation of a roundabout on the A285; Mr Gledhill explained junction improvements were not necessary as part of the development based on the site access arrangements being offered by the applicant. In addition, Mrs Stevens advised it would not be reasonable to request such an improvement, it would not meet any of the legal tests for planning conditions and obligations, and could therefore not be secured through the application.

On the matter of tree mix as part of landscaping proposals; Ms Bell drew the Committee's attention to Condition 19 which would secure all landscaping and planting. It was officer understanding the mix of planting would replicate what was currently onsite.

Responding to concerns regarding the impact of noise and traffic on the health of residents; Mrs Stevens acknowledged concerns raised, and offered sympathies to those who were affected. Unfortunately, there was no evidence to support these concerns.

With regards to noise; Mrs Stevens informed the Committee the application had been subject to a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which considered the impact of noise, from traffic, construction and operation as part of the process. This had been reviewed by the Environmental Health Team and no objection has been raised.

Mrs Stevens advised the Committee there were no reasonable grounds to refuse the application on the grounds of health and noise impact.

Mrs Stevens advised the Committee it would not be reasonable to include a condition dictating the types of vehicles staff were permitted use, noting that the applicants are in the room and have heard the concerns and could make staff aware. It was an issue which could also be addressed through the new Community Liaison Group.

Mrs Stevens reminded the Committee the NPPF placed significant weight on the development of Economic Growth and that the site was identified for expansion in the emerging Local Plan Policy.

Responding to concerns HGVs would be crossing the highway; Mr Gledhill assured the Committee this had been considered through the Road Safety Audit. He acknowledged some vehicles may have to wait, but the proposal met all the relevant design standards.

Mrs Rollings provided further information on the economic significance of the site and how it contributed to the local economy.

Responding to further concerns the development will have on local residents; Ms Bell explained the internal road network would mean no site traffic would travel through Maudlin. In addition, it was important to note the change in shift patterns which would mean shifts were not exiting or entering at the same time.

Mr Gledhill confirmed there would be traffic monitoring at the site. The applicant also had a Travel Plan which would look at the assumptions made in Travel Assessment.

Mr Gledhill confirmed no road widening was require as part of development.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to defer for S106 then permit.

Resolved; **defer for S106 then permit**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

*\*Members took a 10 minute break*

195 **HN/23/01377/FUL - Kipson Bank Farm, Selsey Road, Hunston, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 1AU**

Mr Mew introduced the report. He outlined the site location, highlighting its proximity to the Kipson House which was a Grade II listed building.

Mr Mew explained the site had been subject to a prior approval application and had prior approval permission to 2 dwelling houses.

The Committee were shown the proposed elevations.

Mr Mew detailed the access arrangements to the site.

Representations were received from;

Mrs Carol Smith – Hunston Parish Council  
Ms Lisa Jackson – Agent

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;

Responding to concerns of potentially hazardous materials already being onsite; Mr Mew drew the Committee's attention to Condition 3 which would require the applicant to undertake a refurbishment and demolition survey before any development began.

On the matter of proposed building materials; Mr Mew drew attention to Condition 4 which required the applicant to submit a full schedule of materials and finishes to be used on the external walls and roof for approval before development commences.

On the matter of Landscaping; Mr Mew drew attention to Condition 9 which secured all landscaping matters.

Regarding the potential of the development on bats; Mr Mew confirmed the Environmental Strategy team had been consulted and recommended certain conditions to mitigate any impacts to protected species.

Mr Mew clarified what a package treatment water plant was.

Miss Smith agreed it was reasonable for an additional condition to request the solar panels be installed in matt black.

Responding to the request for bee bricks to be included in Condition 10; Miss Smith, cautioned against including them as part of Condition 10 as they had not been requested by the Environmental Strategy team.

Mrs Stevens addressed concerns of the design of the developments and explained how they had been designed to settle into the rural environment.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to permit with S106.

Resolved; **permit with S106**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report and the additional condition for matt black solar panels.

196 **NM/23/02240/DOM - 3 Vinnetrow Cottages, Vinnetrow Road, Runcton, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 1QH**

Mr Mew introduced the report. He outlined the site location and highlighted the extension which had been completed on the neighbouring property.

The Committee were shown the proposed elevations and floorplans.

There were no representations.

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;

On the matter of bee bricks; Miss Smith agreed to discuss their use further with the Ecology Manager.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to permit.

Resolved; **permit**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

197 **SI/23/02901/FUL - Land South Of 63 Street End Lane, Sidlesham, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 7RG**

Miss Haigh introduced the report. She drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included an amendment to the recommendation from permit to defer for S106 then permit.

Miss Haigh outlined the site location. She informed the Committee the development would be conditioned so that it could only be used for tourist accommodation.

As part of the development a wetland area would be created in the south of the site.

Representations were received from;

Mr Edward Rees – Agent

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the amended recommendation to defer for S106 then permit.

Resolved; **defer for S106 then permit**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

198 **SB/22/00593/FUL - Land South Of West View Cottages, South Lane, Southbourne**

Mr Mew introduced the report. They drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included the following; an additional comment; an amendment to the recommendation and an amendment to condition 1.

Mr Mew clarified why the application had been brought back to Committee.

Mr Mew outlined the site location, he highlighted its proximity to the Chichester Harbour AONB and the settlement boundary which abutted the site.

Mr Mew showed where the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan Green Ring would pass through the site.

The Committee were shown the proposed elevations, layout and streetscene.

Representations were received from;

Cllr Amanda Tait – Southbourne Parish Council  
Mr Kris Mitra – Agent

Before responding to comments and questions the Chair invited Mrs Stevens to clarify the policy position as detailed in paragraph 4.7 (page 53) of the report.

Following a vote, the Committee note the contents of this report and endorse the resolution of the 4 October 2023 Planning Committee to defer the application for S106 and then permit subject to: i. conditions as set out in Appendix 1 and as amended by the Update Sheet.

Resolved; the Committee note the contents of this report and endorse the resolution of the 4 October 2023 Planning Committee to **defer the application for S106** and then permit subject to: i. conditions as set out in Appendix 1 and as amended by the Update Sheet.

199 **SB/23/01952/FUL - The Sussex Brewery - REPORT TO FOLLOW**

Miss Haigh introduced the report. She drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included an additional comment received from the applicant.

Miss Haigh informed the Committee there was a very similar scheme being currently considered at appeal.

Miss Haigh outlined the site location, drawing attention to the building's proximity to the public right of way to the south and the listed building.

The Committee were shown the proposed layout, elevations and floorplan. She explained the ridge height would increase in order accommodate the proposed first floor living accommodation.

As part of the development the pub would lose one parking space.

Miss Haigh confirmed there would be no changes to the current site access.

The Committee were shown swept path analysis which demonstrated how both a van and refuse truck would enter and exit the site.

Representations were received from;

Cllr Amanda Tait – Southbourne Parish Council  
Mr Barry Redsull - Objector  
Mr Jake Russell – Agent

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;

Mrs Stevens confirmed the Southbourne Neighbourhood Plan carried full weight and was a material consideration.

Responding to concerns the development would negatively impact the pub; Mrs Stevens acknowledged concerns but explained the building did not form part of the current leasehold arrangement with the Landlord.

On the matter of proposed parking provision; Miss Haigh confirmed the provision of two parking spaces was reasonable for a development of this size.

Miss Haigh confirmed the potential impact the development may have on the listed building had been considered by officers. In officer opinion there would be no detrimental impact caused.

On the matter of highway safety; Miss Haigh informed the Committee that these concerns had been raised with WSCC Highways, following the applications deferral. WSCC Highways had no concern as there were no proposed changes to the site access and the impact from one dwelling would not have any significant impact on the highway.

Regarding the removal of permitted development rights; Miss Haigh drew attention to Condition 13 which would remove any future permitted development rights.

Miss Smith confirmed the ownership of the two parking spaces would not be part of the development, but would be provided for them.

Responding to concerns of service vehicles accessing the site; Miss Smith explained the swept path analysis showed how such access could be accommodated.

Miss Haigh explained resident access to the site would be protected during construction through condition; however, she acknowledged there would be some disruption.

Miss Smith informed the Committee the impact of the development had been considered and was addressed in the report. the building did not form part of the pub leasehold and evidence submitted by the applicant demonstrated the business would still be viable. It would be unreasonable to refuse the application because it may have a future impact on the viability of the pub.

On the matter of over development; Miss Haigh informed the Committee it was officer opinion that the development did not constitute over development.

Miss Haigh confirmed the impact of the pub on future occupiers had been considered, with a detailed noise mitigation plan required before any commencement of building.

Miss Haigh agreed it did appear the bins would be moved from the shed to a parking space, however, the loss of 4 parking spaces was not official and the application could only be assessed on the evidence provided.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to **defer for S106 then permit.**

Resolved; **defer for S106 then permit**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

200 **WW/23/01781/FUL - Briar Cottage, Meadow Lane, West Wittering, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 8LR**

Miss Haigh introduced the report. She highlighted the site location which was situated within the West Wittering settlement boundary. The site abutted the cricket ground to the east and the West Wittering Conservation Area to the south.

The Committee were shown the proposed layout, floorplans and elevations.

Miss Haigh informed the Committee that the trees on site would be retained and secured through Conditions.

Representations were received from;

Mr Martin Swatton – Agent

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;



Miss Haigh informed the Committee that the proposed swimming pool would be installed within the ground. The pool would be screened by a 1.9m wall which was already in place.

Miss Haigh explained there would be no more impact from noise as the pool was located within the residential garden.

Miss Hayes confirmed the neighbouring property, Little Hayes, was located within the Conservation Area.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to **permit**.

Resolved; **permit**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

201 **SDNP/22/05843/ADV - One Stop, 6 Midhurst Road, Fernhurst.**

Mr Price introduced the report. He outlined the application site, highlighting its proximity to the conservation area and Listed Buildings.

The Committee were shown an elevation of the sign, which would be set very close to the building. Mr Price informed the Committee that the applicant had amended their original design so that it was more in keeping with the local area. He confirmed there would be no external lighting.

There were no representations.

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;

Mr Price advised the Committee the content of the advertising display was not a planning matter.

Mr Price explained the display sign would be a recessive display.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to **approve**.

Resolved; **approve**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report.

202 **Chichester District Council Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

Mrs Stevens introduced the item. She drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which set included updates on the following Court Matters; Land East of Farmfield Nurseries; Crouchlands – Lagoon 3; Land South of the Stables and; 82a Fletchers Lane.

The Committee noted the report.

203 **South Downs National Park Authority Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

Mrs Stevens introduced the report, she drew attention to the Agenda Update which included a summary of the Appeal decision for SDNP/23/00351/HOUS.

The Committee noted the report.

204 **Response to Government Changes to Various Permitted Development Rights Consultation**

Mr Mew presented the report. He provided a brief summary outlining the background of what permitted development rights were and the purpose of the consultation being considered.

Mr Mew explained what the consultation covered and drew attention the key headlines. A full set of responses to all 44 questions was included in Appendix 1 of the report.

Mr Mew asked if members had any additional representations to make they do so by email before the end of the following so they can be considered and included within the response.

Officers responded to comments and questions as follows;

Mr Mew agreed the response to Q44. could be changed to 'No'

Mr Mew agreed the response to Q46. Could be amended to include reference noise impact as well.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation and the amended responses.

**Resolved; That the Planning Committee consider and agree the attached responses as amended to the consultation questions for submission in response to the government 'Changes to various permitted development rights: consultation.**

205 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**

There were no late items.

206 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no part 2 items.

The meeting ended at 2.37 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank