

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Fiona Baker on 01243 534609

Email: fbaker@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House

1 East Pallant

Chichester

West Sussex

PO19 1TY

Tel: 01243 785166

www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Planning Committee** will be held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Wednesday 10 January 2024** at **9.30 am**

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

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

19 **Agenda Update Sheet - 10 January 2024** (Pages 1 - 14)

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee
Wednesday 10 January 2024

ITEM: 5

APPLICATION NO: 22/01485/OUTEIA

COMMENT:

Corrections/updates to report

Paragraph 6.23

The housing mix table at paragraph 6.23 should form part of the preceding paragraph.

Paragraph 6.25

With regard to the issue of Recreational Disturbance, it should be noted that the additional evidence requested in respect of the SANG strategy was subsequently provided by the applicants to the satisfaction of both the CDC ESU and Natural England.

Paragraph 8.11

The words '*and density*' should be deleted from the first sentence.

Paragraph 8.50

'LPAs' should read 'LHAs' (Local Highway Authorities)

Paragraph 8.141

District Council Obligations

7 - Sports Facility to be delivered by 210th occupation.

County Council Obligations

1 – School extension to be delivered by 301st occupation, if developers elect to deliver.

Southern Access Road levels

In order to ensure that there is (i) full scrutiny of the level of the SAR carriageway relative to the surrounding land, and (ii) sufficiently flexibility at the road's detailed design stage, the levels drawings listed below are removed from the approved plans list detailed in condition 3:

- **19342_JUB_SR_DR_C**:151 P10, 152 P9, 153 P8, 161 P9, 162 P8 and 163 P8

- **19342_JUB_PH_DR_C**: 151 P4, 152 P4, 161 P4 and 162 P4

The following **additional condition** is proposed in order to reserve details of the SAR levels:

No development in connection with the Southern Access Road shall commence unless and until plans relating to those works showing details of the existing and proposed ground levels have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The details shall clearly identify the relationship of the proposed carriageway levels with the levels intended for the adjoining parts of the site. The development thereafter shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory relationship results between the new development and adjacent parts of the site. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition as these details relate to the construction of the development and thus go to the heart of the planning permission.

Corrections/amendments to other conditions

Condition 18

Revision numbers of drawings referred to in the condition to be updated to reflect the latest versions.

Condition 19

Delete the words 'aim to' and 'not exceed 50 dB, LAeq,16h (0700-2300 hrs), but shall' from the penultimate sentence.

Condition 38

Replace second sentence with 'The design specifications for the gardens and balconies shall provide for protection from external noise so that the noise levels shall not exceed 55 dB, LAeq 16h (0700 – 2300 hrs)'.

Condition 50

Replace 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CLR11' with 'Land Contamination Risk Management July 2023 or any replacement guidance'.

Condition 52

Replace '07.00' with '07.30'.

Additional third-party comment

- Areas to the south of the Phase 1 Country Park continue to suffer from flooding
- Much of the Phase 1 Country Park planting has failed. All planting should take place at an appropriate time of the year
- Phase 2 should contain more social housing

Information circulated to members of the Committee

- A pack of supporting information has been circulated to members by the applicants' planning consultant
- A representation from a Mr Swann regarding highway considerations has been circulated to members by CDC Democratic Services

ITEM: 6

APPLICATION NO: 23/00600/FUL

COMMENT:

Additional consultee comment

CDC Environmental Protection:

It is stated that the attached Duke and Rye advertising dates back to 2022/2023. Since the introduction of the NMP (April 2023) timings for amplified recorded music are up to 23:00 and then reduced to incidental music at 23:00. DJ Levi Bentley is the predominant DJ and was working when we conducted our monitoring in April and September 2023. He was fully briefed with the NMP and happy to be compliant with the levels set by the limiter.

The following comments relate to Sustainable Acoustics' Technical Memorandum (Dated 27 October 2023).

1. It has to be questioned as to why the Technical Memorandum, which was produced in October 2023, has not been submitted until one week before the Planning Hearing.
2. It is noted that the Technical Memorandum is a review of Acoustic South East's Noise Impact Assessment (Ref: J3691, dated 12/9/23) and Environmental Health comments. I cannot however see a review of our department's comments within the Technical Memorandum. Of note, the Noise Impact Assessment has now been superseded (Ref: J3691, dated 1/11/23 issue 2) and further Environmental Health comments were provided on 14th December 2023.
3. Section 1.1.6 – it is noted the author has not visited the site.
4. Section 3.1.7 – It is agreed that it is not enough to simply avoid a significant adverse impact. Our department considers and has communicated through consultation response, that we are satisfied that adherence to the NMP shall avoid an adverse noise impact and also keep noise to a practicable minimum. This is our consideration when looking to appropriate noise standards, guidance and further to intensive on-site monitoring.
5. Section 4.1.2 – Sentence does not make sense.
6. Section 4.1.3 – Additional conditions have been proposed in the Planning Officers Report to Committee above those highlighted in this section of the Technical Memorandum that offer a further level of safeguarding of amenity. Most notably, *“Notwithstanding the details within the Noise Management Plan, the premises shall not undertake live amplified music at any time”*.
7. Section 5.1.2 – The author states that the Noise Impact Assessment does not carry the weight of his Technical Memorandum, which is the only expert evidence

submitted as part of this application in accordance with the Civil Procedure Rules (Part 35). As stated, in our consultation response, our department considers the Noise Impact Assessment to be robust and we accept the survey methodology, assessment criteria and ultimately the findings of the Report. The Noise Impact Assessment warrants consideration, as it assess impacts during a typical event scenario.

8. Section 5.1.6 – Our department does not agree with the assertion that the Noise Impact Assessment was not taken under representative conditions. Figure 6 of the Noise Impact Assessment demonstrates music noise levels during the assessment were typical, as controlled by the music noise limiter.
9. Section 5.1.7 – The author states that the application of the Pubs and Clubs Guidance (Oct 2005) should be treated with extreme care. It is acknowledged however that the Guidance is still “extant” so therefore still in existence. It is stated that the Guidance has been discredited in case law but the case law is not provided. Our department considers that the Guidance offers an objective level of assessment and only makes up a part of the overall assessment of the venue, which includes our own monitoring.
10. Section 5.1.18 – our department does not agree with the assertion that the situation under assessment was not representative as we do not consider the size of the audience would negatively impact the music noise level being produced.
11. Section 5.1.19 – The author is bringing in to question the description of the soundscape, from photographs, which is not deemed appropriate. A visit to site and some form of assessment would be considered more appropriate before making assumptions based on photographs.
12. Section 5.1.20 – The pub is openly operating to their Premise Licence conditions hence this application is to include the variation of times of operation. What is demonstrated and acknowledged is that at 23:00 the internal music noise level is reduced to around 75dB(A). This is in accordance with the NMP. Our department has experienced that this post 23:00 level is barely audible outside at residential receptors and will not cause sleep disturbance internally with windows open for ventilation.
13. Section 5.1.21 – Our department does not consider there would be any adverse noise impact to extend by operating to the levels in the NMP. We have witnessed this.
14. Section 5.1.22 – Reference to internal levels at a Brighton Club offers context for the low levels that have been set at the Duke and Rye and to offer reassurance that the pub shall not be run as a nightclub, which is a common local misconception when reviewing consultation comments.
15. Section 5.1.23 – Our department does not agree with the assertion that the music noise levels measured in Tower Street “would be likely to cause at least an

observable adverse impact at residential with windows open”. This was not our experience with music witnessed at this type of level and taking in to account the context of the area. Also, the expectation for a wide open window offering between 5dB to 0dB(A) is an unreasonable expectation as attenuation is routinely assumed on a window open for ventilation and not fully open.

16. Section 5.1.34 – The author expresses the view that the reduced lower level after 23:00 achieves a Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL).

17. Section 5.1.25 –

- I) We have observed and are satisfied the noise limiter is in a locked room and is tamper proof, within reason.
- II) The author argues that the music noise levels set by the limiter are too low and barely commercially workable. This is the level that the current building fabric allows and what the venue is agreeable to. The limiter is tamper proof. Breach of the NMP music noise levels could be open to enforcement action through planning if the NMP was a condition.
- V) It is considered the dispersal policy deals with patrons leaving the venue. The area is subject to other people passing at that time of night. Access has not been granted to assess inside neighbouring properties, even once offered.
- VI) Having monitored the music noise limiter in operation and the fact music levels are reduced at 23:00 our department is satisfied that an appropriate level of residential amenity is achieved. After 23:00 music noise levels were barely audible in the street so the “virtually inaudible” internal criteria would be met.
- VII) Music noise levels are reduced to incidental music at 23:00 and there is a dispersal policy in place.

18. Section 5.1.26 - Again the author states that the music noise levels set are commercially unworkable. This is a decision for the venue and they have been operating to these levels since at least April 2023, with no concern. We don't agree that the NMP is primarily about the Premises Licence as it makes reference to Planning requirements in the document.

19. Section 5.1.27 – The author believes the Conditions should not be varied on the basis of the technical evidence in the Noise Impact Assessment. This is not the only technical evidence. Our department has conducted our own assessments also.

20. Section 5.1.28 – No access has been granted recently for internal measurements to be conducted. The two monitoring positions selected in the Noise Impact Assessment are considered worse case and therefore account for impact at other neighbouring properties.

21. Section 5.1.30 – The NMP in Appendix A of the Noise Impact Assessment is taken from the Planning Portal that is detailed as Final V3 21.04.23 therefore revision number and date are available.
22. Section 5.1.31 – It is considered the NMP achieves the protection of amenity and appropriate planning aims regardless of the language used in the NMP. The applicant acknowledges that Condition 16 is being breached currently, that is why the variation is being sought in liaison with the Planning Enforcement Department.
23. Section 5.1.32 – Sound checks are taken FOH before each event night to check limiter levels are being maintained. Our department has checked records are up to date when last monitored and on one other unannounced visit.
24. Section 5.1.33 – Window electrical contact trips linked to the limiter are not deemed necessary, at this time, as unannounced monitoring does not suggest leaving windows and doors open is an issue.
25. Section 5.1.34 - Our department has worked with the venue to ensure they are trained with the use of their sound level meter and are aware of the A-weighting on the meter. The Type 2 meter is only used for indicative purposes to identify any potential issues with the noise limiter. It is a further control on top of the limiter.
26. Section 5.1.35 – The NMP is not inadequate. We have witnessed staff implementing the Plan during an unannounced visit. An appropriate level of residential amenity is achieved by adhering to the Plan.
27. Section 6.1.2 – There has indeed been a history of noise complaints in relation to the Duke and Rye. These have been addressed and appropriate measures adopted to rectify the issues identified. It is incorrectly stated, by the author, that improvements have occurred since Aug 2023. The current NMP was finalised 21.04.2023 and extensive monitoring was conducted by our department on Friday 28th April 2023 which confirmed the NMP was adequate and could be implemented by the venue. Further unannounced monitoring demonstrated continued adherence to the NMP by the venue. The NMP has been in place for at least 8 months, with evidence of compliance. It is considered that adherence to the NMP shall avoid an adverse noise impact and keep noise to a practicable minimum in accordance with National and Local Planning Policy.
28. Section 6.1.3 –
- 1) The music is turned right down at 23:00 in accordance with the NMP.
 - 2) Having been to site with the noise limiter in operation it is evident that the “virtually inaudible” criteria post 23:00 shall be met internally in neighbouring properties as it is barely audible outside at this time.
 - 3) It is agreed that the wording in the NMP leans towards licensing objectives however adequate planning criteria is met by adhering to the noise limiter and other mitigation controls. The NMP is enforceable in the opinion of the Planning Enforcement Department.

29. Section 6.1.4 – Our departments monitoring has demonstrated that the NMP is adequate and fit for purpose. An Acoustic Impact Assessment concludes the installed sound limiting device was noted to be working and the music level restricted to that required of the NMP.

30. Section 6.1.5 – Our department does not agree with the expert witness's conclusions. From the evidence we have personally witnessed at site and findings of the Noise Impact Assessment it has been demonstrated that an acceptable level of residential amenity shall be secured and we fully support the variation of conditions, subject to the proposed conditions.

Environmental Protection Comments against points raised in the submission of 04.01.2024 from RADAR Community Group circulated to Planning Committee Members:

CONDITION 16.

1. Live amplified music does not form part of this variation application and it is proposed live amplified music will be prohibited through condition.
2. RADAR's commissioned expert witness points out that the "Pubs and Clubs guidance" (DEFRA) is still in existence and in his opinion should be applied with extreme care. The case law that discredits the Guidance has not been provided. Our department considers that the Pubs and Clubs Guidance does provide an objective guideline and it should be noted that it only acts as part of the overall assessment, which includes our own department's monitoring.
3. The premises has no intention to play live amplified music.
4. Our department's own monitoring does not indicate a noise nuisance outside the Prebendal School opposite the Duke and Rye, with the implementation of the NMP. This is documented in our consultation response.
5. The music noise levels have been limited to account for the building envelope of the premises and surrounding locale.
6. Our department considers that case law, Developing Retail Limited V East Hampshire Magistrates Court demonstrates that condition 16 is not enforceable. The Planning Enforcement Department considers the NMP as proposed to be an enforceable document.
7. A Planning Enforcement Notice has been served but this does not guarantee a successful prosecution, for non-compliance.
8. All consultation comments shall be considered as part of the planning process.
9. The above information has not been provided, for review or consideration, to our department's knowledge.

CONDITION 4.

1. This is an incorrect interpretation of the legislation. A Licence review can take place, independent of any planning decision. The more stringent hours would set precedence.

2. Our department considers that reducing the music to incidental levels at 23:00 and adhering to the dispersal policy in the NMP will ensure an appropriate level of amenity for all neighbouring premises, including the school.

3. Again, all comments are considered as part of the planning process.

Comments relating to the Sustainable Acoustic Report are provided above.

Additional third-party comments:

Two additional third party comments objecting the proposals have been received, which can be summarised as follows:

- The site is opposite a boarding school. No reference is made to the young boarders
- There are existing breaches
- Impact from noise on neighbouring residents
- The occupant is altered in advance to take action to achieve an adequate reading
- Independent reports confirm noise levels above those claimed by the venue
- That the Noise Management Plan does not include live performances
- Criteria relied upon in the submission has been discredited
- Highlighting consultee comments received during the application
- There is a history of non-compliance
- Attaching an independent Acoustic Technical Memorandum which was circulated to Members concluding that the application should be refused.

ITEM: 7

APPLICATION NO: 22/03201/LBC

COMMENT:

Additional Condition:

Condition 6

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved stone cleaning method statement (22 December 2022), unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the architectural and historic character of the Listed Building.

ITEM: 9

APPLICATION NO: 22/02382/FUL

COMMENT:

Addendum to the report

The second bullet point of paragraph 3.2 should read:

Alterations to the internal layout of the flats, including the Flat 1 on the ground floor being changed to a two-bed unit from a three-bed unit as previously approved, and Flat 5 to change from ~~to~~ a three-bed unit ~~to~~ **from** a two-bed unit.

ITEM: 10

APPLICATION NO: 22/02446/FUL

COMMENT:

Additional third-party comments

Two additional objection comments have been received, including one Counsel Opinion concerning the following:

- The report contains material factual inaccuracies from the applicants of this case.
- The report references land to be farmed of 26ha but this is actually 6ha.
- Concern that the building was assessed as modest in scale and not visible from harbour
- The proposed barn is larger and in a very different design than any of the other surrounding buildings.
- There is no explanation as to why the report complies with Policy 45, given the very small site to be farmed and other options for storage within existing clusters of farm buildings.
- The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 significantly uplifted the status of National Landscapes with regard to planning considerations, the AONB has the highest protection status under the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Introducing a barn on a parcel of land previously undeveloped will alter its appearance. Given that the key component of this NL is its visual appearance, deriving from its natural beauty, introducing a building will obviously impact it.
- There are views from a private domestic property.
- The applicants landscape consultant has overlooking possible views.
- Limited weight should be given to the applicant's agricultural consultant
- A lack of substance in the Natural England consultee reply.
- The officer has not set out the correct statutory duty or policy guidance, and concern about level of analysis

- The barn is disconnected from the host farm.
- The Harbour is part of the 'Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation' ("SAC"). The report nor Natural England make reference to it.

Additional Supporting Information

The applicant has provided an opinion from a farm consultant, which advises:

- The forage area of the foreshore block extends to 6ha of grass which would yield at least 42 tonnes of hay. This equates to 2,100 'pick-up' bales with an individual volume of 0.134m³. This would require a storage volume of 281m³, and stacked to the eaves, this would require 77 sqm of the 110 sqm sought by the barn.
- The style of barn 'Yorkshire boarded' means air can flow through the hay stored inside.
- The existing tin shed is too small and does not facilitate breathing.
- Using wrapped bales causes grass to ferment and make haylage, which causes the grass to exude a high nitrogen liquor that will leak through the bale wrap into the soil around the stack.
- The most sensitive storage solution is dry unwrapped hay inside a barn.
- There is not a machine to my knowledge that wraps small bales, therefore large bales would have to be used which would weigh at least 200kg each. These would require large machinery to move.
- The most environmentally sensitive forage solution is pick-up bales (~20kg) that can be man-handled and delivered to the sheep with a quad bike.
- Hay could be stored at the main farmyard and delivered daily to the sheep during the winter. However, this represents a 3km round trip by the shepherd each day, and unnecessary additional local traffic when the material could be stored at the pasture.
- Good shepherds are hard to come by and it makes the job more onerous and tedious if they have to import the materials for their trade every day.

In addition, the applicant has provided the following additional comments on the legal opinion provided. They include correspondence from the soil association on the benefits of small bale farming and the advice against plastic wrapped bales.

- The legal opinion includes assumptions which are not fact checked.
- Planning law allows for the construction of a barn in this acreage within permitted development rights in the AONB.
- Barns are a common sight in the countryside.
- Farmed and meadow land requires management, it does not look after itself.
- The site currently lies degenerating, this application is to enhance a National Landscape and failure to do so erodes the ecological environmental heritage.
- There is a role for smaller scale producers who do not require big equipment, a dependence on contractors and want to move away from plastic wrapped haylage which creates as much environmental pollution as it is unsightly to look at.

- A storage area for bales needs to protect them but does not need to be as big for a small bale and hand-based system as it would for a tractor-based system and can be much easier to blend into the environment.
- There is very strong evidence that a hay-based system which involves later grass cutting leads to more wildflower species and a more diverse grassland with more butterflies and beneficial insects.
- There is also more bird and animal biodiversity by allowing ground nesting birds such as skylarks and partridges to produce young and later cutting allows leverets to be active enough to avoid mowers.
- One further environmental cost of that is the compaction associated with heavy bales being transferred round the land to the feeders. Compaction of soil under tyres and around feeders will reduce water infiltration, increase run off and pollution risk whilst the areas around feeders can become extremely poached increasing pollution risk.
- Objection commons for on private views and amenity.
- The initiative enables the land to be improved according to the principles of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy. The Chichester Harbour Conservancy consultee reply advises the site is not visible from public vantage points or from the harbour itself due to tree screening lining Hook Lane. Their comments also advise it would be difficult to argue that the proposed barn would have a harmful impact on the natural beauty of the AONB landscape
- The question in visual impact terms, where is the demonstrable harm.

Officer response to Counsel Opinion

The following expands upon the current explanation of the effects upon the AONB:

The site is located within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The amendments to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 as legislated for through the Levelling-UP and Regeneration Act 2023 requires *'in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty in England, a relevant authority must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty'*. Similarly, Paragraph 182 of the NPPF 2023 states *'great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues'*. This aligns with Policy 43 which amongst other requirements, requires the *'the natural beauty and locally distinctive features of the AONB are conserved and enhanced'* and seeks to ensure *'proposals reinforce and respond to, rather than detract from, the distinctive character and special qualities of the AONB'*.

As detailed within the report, and the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) the application field benefits from a large amount of natural screening, helping to minimise the visual impact of the proposed barn. In part, the raised nature of the field, helps to screen wider views, particularly when travelling along the northern part of Hook Lane. Nevertheless, the barn would be visible on the part of Hook Lane immediately adjacent to

the barn and from within Hook Farm. In addition, and as previously noted within the report, views of the barn are likely to be possible from the harbour, though relatively narrow viewpoints that are for the most part filtered by various natural landscape features, including tree belts and hedgerows. The barn would also be read in the context of Hook Farm and its outbuildings, the corrugated shed, and the nearby Hook Creek (detached two storey dwelling) and thus would not be an isolated structure. The ability to see the barn from the harbour or within public and private land does not mean it is harmful.

In acknowledging its sensitive surroundings, the barn is relatively modest in scale, measuring 13.8m in length, 8m in width and 4.8m in height. This is not considered to be excessive for the intended purpose, proportionate in scale to the size of the holding, and would be notably smaller than the existing Green Barn. The barn would also be constructed out of appropriate materials, mute in colour, helping it to assimilate into its surroundings as far as possible. It is also important to consider that the established character of this part of the AONB is one of a rural farming landscape, where you would expect, and do encounter, associated farm development, much like the existing Green Barn and the neighbouring commercial activities. As a consequence, due to the siting of the barn, its relatively modest scale, and appropriate materials, and despite localised visibility from Hook Lane and Hook Farm and the possible, albeit restricted, views from within the Harbour, the presence of the barn is not considered to be of detriment to the AONB and would conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The proposal therefore complies with the requirements of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended), Section 15 of the NPPF and Policy 43 of the Local Plan.

Addendum to the report

Paragraph 8.16 to read as follows:

The site is situated approximately 140 metres north of Old Park Wood which is designated as Chichester Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA), **Chichester Harbour Special Area of Conservation (SAC)**, and Chichester Harbour RAMSAR and as a **Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI)**. The site is situated approximately 115 metres west of the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA, **SAC**, RAMSAR site and **SSSI**. Accordingly, the application has been accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which has been reviewed by the Councils Environmental Strategy Officer, who has confirmed, subject to the mitigation and suggested enhancements being secured via condition, they have no objection to the proposed development. However, it has been advised to secure further details via a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure the development does not adversely impact nesting or overwintering birds and does not adversely impact the biodiversity of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, the subject to future compliance with conditions, the proposal would comply with Policy 49 of the Local Plan and the Planning Principles 01 of the Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan and Policies 6 and 7 of the Bosham Neighbourhood Plan.

ITEM: 12

APPLICATION NO: 23/01279/FUL

COMMENT:

Application withdrawn on 22 December 2023.

ITEM: 13

APPLICATION NO: SDNP/23/04565/FUL

COMMENT:

Amend condition 3 to remove use class E(b) as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), the development hereby approved shall only be used for purposes within Class E (a), ~~(b)~~, (c), (e) and (g)(i) and (g) (ii) and no other use as defined within Schedule 2, Part 3, Classes shall be carried out on the site.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control the development of land.

ITEM: 14

APPLICATION NO: SDNP/23/02453/FUL

COMMENT:

Amend condition 3 as follows:

~~3. All external materials used in the construction of the development hereby approved shall match the type, texture, composition, colour, size and profile of those used on the existing building and shall be retained permanently as such, unless prior written consent is obtained from the Local Planning Authority to any variation.~~

~~Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the building and the character of the area.~~

3. The materials used in the construction of the development hereby approved shall be as detailed within the permitted application particulars and shall be retained permanently as such, unless prior written consent is obtained from the Local Planning Authority to any variation.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the building and the character of the area.

Addition of condition 5 as follows:

5. The site outlined in red on the Location Plan (TQRQM23060104308489) shall not be used other than for permissible community access for recreation; and for no other purpose including any other purpose in Class F2; of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987) (as amended) or in any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification. Should the permissible community access for recreation use cease then the land shall revert back to an agricultural use.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to regulate and control the development of land.
