

# 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 the Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Wednesday 6 July 2022 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman),  
Mr G Barrett, Mr B Brisbane, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs J Fowler,  
Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers,  
Mrs S Sharp and Mr P Wilding

## SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

- 2 **Approval of Minutes** (Pages 1 - 17)  
The minutes relate to the meeting of the Planning Committee on 15 June 2022.

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Wednesday 15 June 2022 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mr B Brisbane, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs J Fowler, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers and Mrs S Sharp

**Members not present:** Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra and Mr P Wilding

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present:** Mrs F Baker (Democratic Services Officer), Miss J Bell (Development Manager (Majors and Business)), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Mr M Mew (Principal Planning Officer), Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer), Mr J Saunders (Development Manager (National Park)), Mrs F Stevens (Divisional Manger for Planning) and Mr R Young (Development Manager (Applications))

## 234 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

Apologies were received from Cllr Johnson, Cllr McAra and Cllr Wilding.

The Chairman announced Planning Application KD/21/00427/FUL; The Workshop, Village Road, Kirdford, would be considered as an additional application under agenda item 16a, this item would be brought forward to agenda item 13. They confirmed all papers had been made available for public inspection five clear working days ahead of the Planning Committee.

## 235 **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 May 2022 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

## 236 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

## 237 **Declarations of Interests**

Mr Barrett declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6 – CH/21/02361/FUL - as the External Appointment to Chichester Harbour Conservancy.

Mr Potter declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 12 – SDNP/21/05833/FUL – as the External Appointment to the South Downs National Park
- Agenda Item 13 – SDNP/22/00098/FUL – as the External Appointment to the South Downs National Park

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 5 – WH/21/00489/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 6 – CH/21/02361/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 7 – CC/21/00382/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 8 – CC/22/00786/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 9 – CC/21/03657/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 16 – KD/21/00427/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 5 – WH/21/00489/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 6 – CH/21/02361/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 7 – CC/21/00382/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 8 – CC/22/00786/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 9 – CC/21/03657/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 16 – KD/21/00427/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

Mrs Sharp declared a personal interest in;

- Agenda Item 5 – WH/21/00489/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 6 – CH/21/02361/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 7 – CC/21/00382/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council and a Member of Chichester City Council
- Agenda Item 8 – CC/22/00786/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 9 – CC/21/03657/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council and a Member of Chichester City Council
- Agenda Item 10 – CC/22/00428/ADV – Member of Chichester City Council

- Agenda Item 16 – KD/21/00427/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

238 **WH/21/00489/FUL - Lanburn Connemaras Swallow Beck Madgwick Lane Westhampnett Chichester West Sussex PO18 0GY**

Mr Mew presented the report to the Committee. He explained the application was for a change of use of land, for use as a certified 'Caravan and Motorhome Club' site for up to five motorhomes and caravans.

Mr Mew informed the Committee that it was important to note the application would normally have been 'Permitted Development', however in this instance planning permission is required due to the need to mitigate impact from the application on birds in the harbour and nitrate neutrality.

The site is located to the south of Madgwick Lane, located close to the Goodwood motor circuit and the Rolls Royce factory. Mr Mew highlighted the area of land where the pitches would be located and highlighted the location of the proposed service point.

To provide context and demonstrate why officers considered the site to be sustainable, Mr Mew showed the Committee a map with other certified sites in the South of the district, most of which were in rural locations outside settlement boundaries and away from public services.

There were no representations

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

In response to concerns regarding access to the site; Mr Shaw reminded the Committee the site access was already established. He confirmed that Highway officers had visited the site and were confident that the required visibility splay could be achieved. He drew attention to Condition 4 of the Report (p.32) which prohibited occupation of the site until the visibility splays had been achieved. The condition also required the splays to be maintained.

With regards to concern over the ownership of the 'verge'; Mr Shaw acknowledged comments made, he explained that ownership of the land was not a material planning consideration. The area of land required for the visibility splay was currently unregistered, he informed the Committee that the applicant was currently going through the process to get control of the required area of land. He assured the Committee that the Condition could not be discharged if the land could not be maintained.

On the issue of footway provision; Mr Shaw confirmed a pedestrian access had been considered, however, at sites such as the one being considered, it was not unusual for there to be no footway provision. He explained that mitigation could only be secured against the impact of the development and officers did not believe there was enough justification, based on the number of potential trips, to secure a new

footway. In addition, Mr Shaw made the Committee aware of improvements being undertaken at Madgwick Park which the site would benefit from.

In response to concerns regarding access for those with disability; Ms Stevens confirmed the application did not conflict with any policies.

In a vote the Committee agreed to support the report recommendation to defer for S106 and then permit subject to conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

*\*Members took a five-minute break*

239 **CH/21/02361/FUL - Cockleberry Farm, Main Road, Bosham, Chichester, West Sussex, PO18 8PN**

Ms Bell presented the report to the Committee. She provided the following verbal update;

- An additional condition for the requirement of a sample flint panel wall for plot 9 would be included if the application is permitted.

Ms Bell highlighted the application, which was located on the northside of the main road and between the settlement boundaries of Nutbourne East and Broadbridge. The Chichester Harbour AONB is located to the south of the site

Access to the site is shared with three other dwellings and set back approximately 100m from the road. Ms Bell confirmed the land was designated as previously developed land.

Ms Bell showed the Committee the current site layout which was 'mixed use', comprising of 1715m<sup>2</sup> of industrial and warehouse buildings (falling under Use Class E), a B8 storage container, four caravans/park homes and equestrian stables. Ms Bell highlighted where these units were currently located.

Ms. Bell informed the Committee the applicant had undertaken a commercial viability report (May 2022), which had considered the viability of redevelopment, subsequent modelling demonstrated the site did not support sustainable long-term employment. Ms Bell confirmed it was officer opinion Policy 26 was not triggered.

Ms Bell clarified the application was for full permission for the development of nine open market dwellings, including associated works. A commuted sum for Affordable Housing would be secured through S106 agreement. Ms Bell detailed the proposed mix of housing and layout, with a density of 16 dwellings per hectare. She highlighted the proposed parking arrangements which would consist of 17 on-plot parking spaces and nine garages, there would also be two visitor spaces. The proposal included a minimum of 20% active electrical charging points.

Ms Bell detailed the proposed landscaping and informed the Committee the current hedging would be maintained wherever possible. She highlighted a 3m maintenance buffer to the north of the site which was secured through condition.

Ms Bell drew Member's attention to the 1.5m maintenance buffer for the drainage ditch which ran to the western boundary of the site, along with a 3m access for a small digger; she confirmed this was secured by condition.

Ms Bell showed the Committee the proposed elevations for the different dwellings.

As part of the development the existing access onto the Main Road would be improved through the removal of a small brick structure which would allow the bell mouth to be widened and achieve the required visibility splays.

Ms Bell informed the Committee that the development would require nitrate mitigation, and a site of .366ha was required to offset the development. The applicant was proposing an area of land in East Dean which was classified as a mix of grade 3 and grade 4, Ms Bell confirmed the area of land was in the fluvial catchment of the Solent Maritime SAC. A S106 is recommended to secure the mitigation and ensure the land is taken out agricultural in perpetuity. Ms Bell confirmed Natural England had raised no objection to the application.

The Committee received representations from;

Cllr Jane Towers – Parish Council Representative

Mr Stephen Johnson – Objector

Mr Chris Snowdon – Objector

Mr Julius Thurgood - Objector

Mr Paul White – Agent

Cllr Adrian Moss – CDC Ward Member (statement read by Mrs Fiona Baker)

Cllr Penny Plant – CDC Ward Member

Before officers responded to questions from the Committee the Chairman invited Ms Bell and Mr Shaw to clarify the access arrangements to the site and the removal of the wall as raised by Cllr Towers. Mr Shaw highlighted the brick cabinet that would be removed to improve access onto the A259.

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

To help clarify how officers had interpreted both Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan Policies when considering the application; Ms Bell drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 8.11 (p.60) which set out the how the Chidham & Hambrook Neighbourhood Plan Policy LP1 was modified by the Examiner. Having read the Examiner's report, she explained it was officers understanding that the wording had been set out to specifically allow the consideration of detailed Development Management Policies not listed within the Neighbourhood Plan.

With regards to which plan took precedence; Ms Bell informed the Committee legal opinion had been provided for the Green Acre Nursery Site, this was detailed in paragraph 8.8 (p.60) of the report.

In response to concerns regarding the loss of employment from the site; Ms Bell assured the Committee that officers had considered the loss of employment as part of their assessment. The site was mixed use with employment units, stables, and residential dwellings. However, it was officer opinion that the housing need outweighed the loss of employment.

With regards to future maintenance of the drainage ditch; Ms Bell drew the Committee's attention to Condition 27 of the report (p.78) which specifically required a 1.5m wide drainage ditch buffer, she clarified this was in addition to the ditch. She informed the Committee that significant discussions had taken place with the drainage officer and it was anticipated that a small digger would access the ditch through the 3m wide access point and then enter the ditch to undertake clearance and maintenance works. Ms Bell was unable to confirm whether the ditch was located within the red line which marked the site boundary, but confirmed officers were confident they could secure necessary access. In addition, Ms Stevens reminded the Committee that it was riparian responsibility to maintain the drainage ditch, she provided further detail to as to how maintenance would be undertaken.

With regards to the presence of water voles in the ditch; Ms Stevens informed the Committee that the application had been submitted with Ecological surveys and there were no records of protected species on site. She drew the Committee's attention to p51 and p52 which set out comments from the Environmental Strategy Unit.

With regards to Policy 26 being a material consideration; Ms Bell agreed that Policy 26 was a Development Management Policy, however, she explained that not all Development Management Policies needed to be applied, only those considered relevant to the application were considered. Officers had considered Policy 26 and did not believe it was triggered by the application due the site being classified as mixed use.

On the issue of nitrate mitigation; Ms Stevens informed the Committee that the Council were working with a landowner to bring forward a scheme of mitigation. She confirmed that the site did lie within the fluvial catchment of the harbour and a hydrology report had been submitted to demonstrate how the ground water moves and drains into the Harbour. Natural England had no objection to the proposed mitigation for nitrate neutrality. Ms Stevens acknowledged the Committee's concern regarding land being taken out of agriculture, however, there would be biodiversity benefits.

With regards to the monitoring of nitrate mitigation; Ms Stevens explained that as the site was located within the National Park, monitoring would be carried out by the South Downs National Park Authority and a monitoring fee was included within the S106 agreement to cover this. She told the Committee officers were creating an internal mapping system of all areas of land being used for nitrate mitigation. In addition, Ms Golding informed the Committee that the South Downs National Park would undertake annual monitoring for the first 20 years, thereafter every five years, a provision of easy access to sites was also included with no fewer than seven days' notice being given. She confirmed that the SDNPA were a signatory to the S106.



In response to whether Economic Development had recently spoken to tenants; Ms Bell informed the Committee that she was unaware, however, they had been consulted and their comments were included within the report.

The Chairman invited Mr Rahman from the Economic Development team to address the Committee. Mr Rahman confirmed he had visited the site and spoken with several tenants to understand how viable businesses were. In his opinion the businesses located at the site were viable and the premises did offer affordable workspaces. He explained that within the District there was a lack of this type of workspace and further loss would put pressure on other industrial estates.

With regards to access to services, and the appeal decision at Church Road, West Wittering; Ms Bell reminded the Committee that each site was different, however, in that appeal the Inspector was content that not all services were local. In making this recommendation, officers had considered the sustainability elements against the housing requirement and proposed the application is permitted. In addition; Ms Stevens informed the Committee that an Inspector had deemed the site 'mixed use site', it was not a single employment site.

With regards to the proposed housing mix; Ms Bell drew the Committee's attention to page 52 and 53 of the report which detailed the proposed housing mix. The Housing Delivery team had raised no objection to the housing mix. Ms Bell acknowledged comments made regarding the delivery of affordable housing, however, she reminded the Committee that Housing Delivery was District wide and contributions were important to enable future delivery.

In response to safety concerns regarding the site access; Mr Shaw reminded the Committee that the site access was already in use and there was no evidence to suggest any safety issues. In addition, he explained the applicant had demonstrated there would be fewer trips generated from the site if permitted.

The Chairman asked Ms Stevens for advice regarding what weight could be attributed to the loss of employment versus the need for houses. Ms Stevens advised the Committee that it was clear from recent appeal decisions the weight given to market housing was substantial or significant. With regards to the application being considered there was no evidence to suggest the housing mix was not suitable. She reminded the Committee that Mr Shaw had confirmed the highway proposals were acceptable and there were no technical reasons for refusal. With regards to the loss of employment, officers had recognised that there would be some loss of employment, however in officer opinion, the loss of did not outweigh the benefit of the housing.

Following a vote, the Committee; voted against the recommendation to defer for S106 then permit.

Having debated the item and listened to the representations made Cllr Oakley proposed the application be refused for the following reasons;

- 1) The loss of active employment land that would be in contravention of LPP26, particularly noting the final paragraph which notes existing employment land being retained. It has been
- 2) The application did not comply with LPP42 as it did not demonstrate sufficient clarity the ditch on the western boundary would be maintained in perpetuity, to ensure soakaways are allowed to function. The proposed maintenance of the ditch was a Health and Safety measure.

Cllr Potter seconded the proposal.

In response to the proposal, Ms Stevens advised the Committee that it would be difficult to defend the second reason for refusal as there was no objection from the Lead Flood Authority or Drainage Engineer.

With regards to the current dwellings on site; Ms Bell confirmed there were lawful dwellings on the site. Ms Stevens acknowledged there would not be a net gain of nine houses.

Members expressed further concern about the loss of an employment uses on the site despite the fact it was a 'mixed used' brownfield site and not classified as an 'employment site'. Members considered the net gain of housing proposed did not outweigh the economic harm caused by the loss of employment, particularly as there were already residential properties on the site and therefore the net gain in the number of dwellings was not significant.

Following further discussion Cllr Oakley amended his reason for refusal to the following;

- 1) The net increase of proposed dwellings would not outweigh the loss of business uses and existing residencies already on site contrary to policy 26 of the Local Plan.
- 2) The application did not comply with LPP42 as it did not demonstrate sufficient clarity the ditch on the western boundary would be maintained in perpetuity, to ensure soakaways are allowed to function.

Cllr Potter seconded the proposal.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to refuse the application for the reasons set out, against officer recommendation.

*\*Members took a ten-minute break.*

240 **CC/21/00382/FUL - Bartholomews Holdings Bognor Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 7TT**

Mr Young presented the report to the Committee. He drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update sheet which set out an addendum to the report replacing the word 'refuse' with 'refuge'.

Mr Young reminded the Committee that the application had been deferred by the Planning Committee on 21 March 2022 and surmised the reasons for deferral.

He highlighted the site location and explained the application sought permission for the construction of nine residential dwellings and the demolition of the existing office block.

Mr Young drew the Committee's attention to the new detailing on Pot 7 and showed them the more detailed street scene which had been provided by the applicant. He highlighted the proposed layout and parking arrangements.

In response to the request for a refuge on the Bognor Road, Mr Young drew the Committee's attention to pages 98 and 99 of the report which set out the comments from West Sussex County Council as the Highway authority.

Mr Young confirmed the property had been marketed in line with Policy 26.

He informed the Committee that there had been no objection from Natural England in relation to nitrate mitigation.

The Committee received representations from;

Miss Phillipa Gatehouse – Agent

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

In response to a request that an informative be including for CIL spending on a pedestrian refuge; Ms Stevens advised the Committee that it would not be appropriate to include either a condition or an informative for CIL spending. She explained the CIL process behind how CIL monies are prioritised and allocated.

Mr Shaw confirmed that there was continuous access from the application site to Bognor Road.

With regards to the pedestrian refuge; Mr Shaw explained that whilst CIL was in place consideration could only be given to the trips generated from the proposed nine units. There would be a reduction in the number of trips that were generated from the site, the site would also benefit from highway improvements secured through neighbouring developments. In addition, Mr Shaw clarified that whilst in theory there was potential for a pedestrian refuge to be accommodated it would be subject to further investigation work. He acknowledged comments that there was a mechanism for delivering a refuge outside the Planning process.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to defer for S106 then permit; subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

241 **CC/22/00786/FUL - St James Industrial Estate, Westhampnett Road, Chichester, West Sussex PO19 7JU**

Ms Bell presented the report to the Committee. She outlined the site location and provided a background summary to St James Industrial Estate.

Ms Bell highlighted the area within the St James Industrial Estate where the application site was proposed. She explained that the application was for the construction of a Low Voltage (LV) switch room. As there will be no noise emitting plant installed the Environmental Health Officer has confirmed there will be no requirement for any further noise assessment.

In addition, Ms Bell updated the Committee on the boundary treatment of the site and confirmed that it had now been discharged by the applicant.

There were no representations.

There were no comments or questions.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to **permit**; subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

242 **CC/21/03657/FUL - Solent Wholesale Carpet Company Limited Barnfield Drive Chichester PO19 6UX**

Ms Bell presented the report to the Committee. She drew attention to the Agenda Update which included a correction to the report and the inclusion of a new condition. In addition, Ms Bell provided a verbal update and informed the Committee of the following two pre-commencement conditions (which the agent had agreed to);

- Full details to be provided showing the proposed soakaway in relation to an existing venting trench for gas and the existing soakaway. As officers are concerned there may be some overlap
- Full details of how the bund will be reinforced and landscaped, particularly on the eastern edge.

Ms Bell highlighted the site location and confirmed it fell within the settlement boundary of Chichester City Council. She identified neighbouring building including its proximity to Aldi and Home bargains. Ms Bell drew the Committee's attention to the bund and its location alongside The Pitcroft. She explained the existing building

was used as a carpet wholesaler for storage and distribution and the application was for an extension to the existing building.

She highlighted the site access off Barnfield Drive and parking arrangements on site. West Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority have made no objection and have confirmed the parking provision is acceptable.

Ms Bell showed the Committee the proposed elevations, along with the existing and proposed layout plans. Ms Bell confirmed the ownership of the site was up to the little wooden fence (which was highlighted in photographs shown to the Committee).

With regards to the neighbouring residential properties Ms Bell informed the Committee that there was 26m between those on The Pitcroft and the proposed extension.

Ms Bell highlighted the existing bund and its current contours compared with the proposed amendments. The current Bund is 2.3m with vegetation on it, with landscaping in front, the proposed extension would require the bund to be cut to a 60°, which would be reinforced with a textile membrane to allow grass and vegetation to grow through. Ms Bell explained it was the exact methodology for the new bund which officers wished to see and why the additional pre commencement condition had been proposed.

Ms Bell informed the Committee that during the application process further landscaping had been included and were detailed within the report at para 8.30, page 136.

Ms Bell confirmed the drainage officer had considered the proposal. The gutters would drain to a soakaway which would be an extension to the existing soakaway and would be in the northern corner of the site. However, further details and surveys are required to ensure the location is appropriate.

The Committee received representations from;

Mr Garry – Objector  
Mrs Anita Shortman – Objector  
Mr Luke Crooks – Applicant

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

With regards to the site notices; Ms Bell assured the Committee the site notices were replaced.

On the matter of a wildlife survey; Ms Stevens confirmed a preliminary ecological assessment was submitted as part of the application. The assessment had been considered as part of the application and no objections from the Environmental Strategy Unit had been raised, she drew the Committee's attention to comments set out on pages 129 and 130.

With regards to the bund; Ms Stevens provided a brief history to the bund and when it was discharged in 2006. She confirmed there was no requirement in the original application to dictate its size or height.

With regards to the proposed landscaping; Ms Bell informed the Committee there would be 15 additional trees planted, the trees would be planted as semi mature trees (over 4m in height) and planted in front of the bund. There would also be additional shrub planting which would equate to one plant every square metre.

Ms Stevens acknowledged the request to visit other sites should the Committee voted to defer the application. However, she advised the Committee would be considering the separation between The Pitcroft and the application site, not what has been permitted at other locations.

On the matter of Pre-Application advice; Ms Stevens informed the Committee that she was unaware of the discussions that took place; however, officers would have considered the parking arrangements.

With regards to issue of land contamination; Ms Stevens acknowledged the comments made. She informed the Committee that a land contamination report had been submitted as part of the application, however she agreed to follow this up further outside the meeting.

Following Committee discussion Cllr Brisbane proposed the application be deferred for a site visit. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Sharp

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to defer for a site visit.

Resolved; **defer for a site visit**

*\*Members took a 35-minute break.*

*\*Cllr Barrett left at the conclusion of this item.*

243 **CC/22/00428/ADV - 1-3 South Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 1EH**

Mr Young presented the report to the Committee. He explained the application sought permission for the installation of 4 illuminated signs, with trough lighting between ground and first floor level.

Mr Young highlighted the site location and its proximity to the Cathedral and the Cross. He drew the Committee's attention to p.154 of the report and the Standard Conditions recommended, which included no illumination to take place other than during dark hours and during the hours of business.

There were no representations.

There were no comments or questions.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to **permit**; subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

244 **CC/22/00648/FUL - Westgate Leisure Centre Via Ravenna Chichester PO19 1RJ**

Mr Mew presented the report to the Committee. He explained the application was for an air source heat pump and associated compound, which was being installed as part of the public sector decarbonisation scheme.

Mr Mew outlined the site location and highlighted where the pump would be located. He confirmed the site was located outside the conservation area.

Mr Mew informed the Committee the applicant had sought advice during the pre-application stage and drew their attention to Condition 3 (p.163) which requested a noise validation report to be submitted and approved before the pump would be brought into use.

There were no representations.

There were no questions or comments.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to **permit**; subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

245 **SDNP/21/05833/FUL - Part of Lower Diddlesfold Farm Known As Diddlesfold Manor Farm Lot 1 Diddlesfold Lane Northchapel West Sussex**

Mr Price presented the report to the Committee. He explained the reason for Committee referral was due to Parish Council objection. He provided a background summary to the application site and informed the Committee that it had been a former dairy farm but was now a mixed-use establishment with equestrian use.

Mr Price outlined where the proposed all weather turn-out area (AWTA) would be located and explained that a post and rail fence would be installed to secure the area. He informed the Committee that there would be a slight alteration in levels with the southern end of the site being raised slightly above ground level.

The Committee were shown views of the site from the passing bridleway and from Hillgrove Lane.

Mr Price explained that the proposed AWTA would be a complimentary addition to the current establishment by providing a small area of turnout for horses when ground conditions were poor or for when a horse's health required its use. Mr Price clarified the AWTA would be for personal use only and confirmed this was secured through condition.

Mr Price informed the Committee the conditions in the report reflected the proposed supplementary landscaping and surfacing materials. He confirmed there would be no lighting permitted to the development.

The Committee received the representations from;

Mrs Janet Long – Agent

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

Mr Price clarified that the proposed area was not a menage as it was too small, he explained a menage would normally be around 60mx40m in size.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to **permit**; subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

*\*Members took a five-minute break*

246 **SDNP/22/00098/FUL - Land to The North of Blind Lane, Blind Lane, Lurgashall, West Sussex**

Mr Saunders presented the report to the Committee. He drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which clarified the reason for Committee referral. Mr Saunders also provided the following verbal updates;

- The combined floor space recorded in the report is incorrect, the correct combined floor space is 460m<sup>2</sup>
- The site does not lie in the Cocking and Singleton Tunnels SAC buffer as reported in paragraph 8.17, page 190.

Mr Saunders explained the application was two agricultural buildings, one of which was retrospective as the building had been constructed.

Mr Saunders highlighted the site locations; he showed the Committee where the constructed barn was located and drew attention to the proposed site for the second barn. The Committee were shown a number of photos of the site from the Public Rights of Way which passed the site.



Mr Saunders showed the Committee some elevations of the proposed buildings. The building which had already been constructed was stepped and would be used for sheep, it also housed toilet facilities. The second building would be used for the storage of tractors, it would also include space for administration and toilet facilities.

Mr Saunders detailed the four reasons for the proposed recommendation to refuse as set out on page 191 of the report.

The Committee received representations from;

Mr James Rice – Objector  
Mr Kane Adams – Applicant

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

Mr Saunders clarified the site was 6.34ha and not acres.

In the issue of the third reason for refusal; Mr Saunders acknowledged comments and agreed the reason could be expanded to include wording from para 8.14.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to **refuse**; for the reasons set out in the report.

Resolved; **refuse**; for the reasons set out in section 10 of the report.

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

The Committee agreed to note the item.

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

The Committee agreed to note the item.

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

As announced by the Chairman, the Committee considered application KD/21/00427/FUL; The Workshop, Village Road, Kirdford, RH14 ONW. The item was brought forward and discussed as Agenda Item 13.

Mr Young presented the report to the Committee. He explained the reason the application was being presented at Committee was the result of the Parish Council refusing the application.

Mr Young highlighted the site location, he confirmed the site was located within a designated enterprise hub as identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Mr Young highlighted the site access, which was already used by existing buildings on the site and identified the parking arrangements. He also drew attention the rainwater harvesting tank on site which was 3000l.

Mr Young detailed the proposed design and building materials. He showed the Committee the proposed elevations and its proximity to other buildings on site.

He informed the Committee the development would provide bat sensitive lighting and bird boxes, in addition native hedging would be planted. He confirmed no trees would be affected by the development. The site is considered water neutral and supported by Natural England.

Mr young informed the Committee that the hours of operation would be 8am – 7pm Monday to Friday and 9am – 5pm on weekends.

There were no representations.

Officers responded to Member's comments and questions as follows;

With regards to the hours of use; Mr Young clarified the proposed hours of use were in line with the adjoining units which already operated to these hours. He confirmed the hours of operation included Sundays and Bank Holidays.

With regards to Condition 7; Mr Young acknowledged comments made and agreed that it could be reworded to focus the applicant on providing the landscaping and thereafter maintain and regenerate some of the biodiversity lost. In addition, Ms Stevens provided further background to Condition 7 and how it was applied to major applications.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to make the report recommendation to **permit**; subject to the amended conditions and informatives set out in the report.

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

## 250 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no part two items.

The meeting ended at 2.37 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank