

Public Document Pack



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Wednesday 9 November 2022 at 9.30 am

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

Members not present: Mr G Barrett and Mr G McAra

In attendance by invitation:

Officers present: Mrs S Archer (Enforcement Manager), Miss J Bell (Development Manager (Majors and Business)), Mr J Bushell (Principal Planning Officer), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Mr M Mew (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs C Potts (Planning Policy Team Leader), Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer), Mr J Saunders (Development Manager (National Park)), Mrs F Stevens (Divisional Manger for Planning), Smith (Development Manager (Applications)) and Miss K Taylor (Senior Planning Officer)

14 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

Apologies were received from Cllr Barrett and Cllr McAra. Apologies were also received from Cllr Bowden who would be arriving late.

15 **Approval of Minutes**

Following a vote, the minutes of the meeting held on 5 October were agreed as a true and accurate record.

16 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

17 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Donna Johnson declared a personal interest;

- Agenda Item 5 – BO/21/00571/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council & WSCC External Appointment Chichester Harbour Conservancy
- Agenda Item 6 – BO/22/01550/FUL & BO/22/00876/LBC – WSCC External Appointment Chichester Harbour Conservancy
- Agenda Item 7 – BI/22/01742/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council & WSCC External Appointment to Chichester Harbour Conservancy
- Agenda Item 8 – SY/21/02895/FUL – Member of Selsey Town Council
- Agenda Item 10 – WW/22/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 11 – SDNP/21/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Simon Oakley declared a personal interest;

- Agenda Item 5 – BO/21/00571/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 7 – BI/22/01742/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 10 – WW/22/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 11 – SDNP/21/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Henry Potter declared a personal interest;

- Agenda Item 5 – BO/21/00571/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 10 – WW/22/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Carol Purnell declared a personal interest;

- Agenda Item 8 – SY/21/02895/FUL – Member of Selsey Town Council

Mrs Sarah Sharp declared a personal interest;

- Agenda Item 5 – BO/21/00571/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 7 – BI/22/01742/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 10 – WW/22/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council
- Agenda Item 11 – SDNP/21/02183/FUL – Member of West Sussex County Council

18 **BO/21/00571/FUL - Land North Of Highgrove Farm Main Road Bosham West Sussex**

Mr Bushell presented the report to Committee. He drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included; an additional comment from Bosham Parish Council; a correction to the report at paragraph 8.56; a revised plan; an additional condition (condition 33); additional third-party comments and an additional planning comment.

Mr Bushell outlined the application and explained that it was a full application which sought permission for the construction of 300 dwellings, including 90 affordable dwellings, a community hall, public open spaces, and two accesses from the A259 (one of which was a temporary construction access).

Mrs Potts outlined the significance of the site in terms of Planning Policy and the development of the Local Plan. She explained the site had been identified as part of the Preferred Approach for 250 dwellings in 2018, the figure was in addition to the 50 dwellings allocated at the site as part of the adopted site allocations DPD 2018.

Miss Potts explained the Local Plan evidence work continued to support the development of the additional 250 dwellings at the site.

Following an appeal, the Councils current five-year housing land supply figure was set at under five years, however, Mrs Potts told the Committee work was currently being finalised on the updated figures for 2022 – 2027, it was expected this information would be published towards the end of November.

Mr Bushell highlighted the site location. He explained the site was within the Parish of Bosham and adjoined the settlement boundary of Broadbridge, with the Chichester Harbour AONB located to the south of the site.

He showed the Committee a superimposed image to demonstrate how the development would border with the Broadbridge settlement area.

Mr Bushell outlined the proposed access arrangements from the A259 and explained a cycle priority junction was included within the design, which would link with the existing cycleway which crossed the entrance to the site. In addition, the 30mph speed limit would be extended along the A259 past the new site entrance.

Mr Bushell presented the proposed layout of the development and explained how it was designed in a 'perimeter block' approach. He highlighted the following and where they would be located within the development;

- Community Hall – the S106 would secure the management and maintenance of the building
- Allotments
- Green Space and LAP
- Mini Football pitch – an addition to the scheme, that responds to a need to provide facilities for the younger ages.
- Foul water pumping station
- Affordable housing – these would be 'peppercotted' throughout the development and would include a mix of affordable/social rent housing, shared ownership and first homes.

He informed the Committee there would be no streetlighting or floodlights within the development in order to minimise any adverse impact on the dark night sky area. The Committee were informed of the proposed landscaping, which would be secured through Condition 18 and the proposed SUD arrangements.

Mr Bushell outlined the proposed parking arrangements and explained there would be 717 spaces provided in total, with 60 allocated for visitors. He drew the Committee's attention to the natural green route which passed through the development and linked up with the pedestrian/cycle access.

Mr Bushell explained the proposed housing mix, he informed the Committee that the development would comprise of mainly 2 storey dwellings, with some 2.5 storey buildings. He outlined the proposed materials and drew attention to the use of chimneys.

The Committee were informed of the sustainability measures which would be incorporated as part of the design including; a fabric first approach; the installation of solar panels on some houses; restricting water usage to 110/l per day and the provision of EV charging points.

The following representations were received;
Cllr Charlotte Pexton – Bosham Parish Council
Mr Dick Pratt (Bosham Association) – Objector
Dr Richard Austin (Chichester Harbour Conservancy) – Objector
Mr John Nelson (Chichester Harbour Trust) – Objector
Mr James Cross - Applicant
Cllr Penny Plant – CDC Ward Member
Cllr Adrian Moss – CDC Ward Member

The Chairman invited Mr Bushell to respond to concerns regarding the application of the Tilted Balance; Mr Bushell explained what the tilted balance was and when and why it should be applied. He confirmed it was government policy included within the NPPF (paragraph 11).

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

Mr Bushell confirmed the net housing density rate proposed at the site was 30 dwellings/ha. This was below the recommended benchmark in the Local Plan which was 35 dwellings/ha.

On the matter of groundwater overwhelming the SUDS basins; Mr Bushell agreed some areas to the northwest and south west of the site did experience groundwater flooding. However, the drainage strategy had been designed to prevent the ingress of groundwater into the SUDs basins. The basins would be lined, allowing their full volume to be taken by the water channelled to it from the appropriate swales and pipes within the site. The drainage engineers have reviewed the calculations and are satisfied that the drainage provision proposed would have enough capacity been for a 100-year event, plus 40% when considering climate change impacts. The release of water into the system would be no higher than green field rates.

With regards to Condition 10 and foul water capacity; Mr Bushell acknowledged there was an issue with the current infrastructure leading to the Hearts Farm wastewater treatment works. However, there was capacity at the treatment works to manage the foul flows from the proposed development. The applicant would need to

review proposed timescales in order to address the issue of foul flooding and infrastructure to the wastewater works.

Ms Bell assured the Committee that Southern Water were aware of the upgrades required in the offsite network. Any upgrade would be done to the current standard and would be completed as part of the gradual upgrade programme.

On the agricultural land classification; Mr Bushell confirmed the agricultural land classification was grade 1 and 2. He acknowledged that Government advice was to see lower grade land brought forward for development first, however, much of the land in the district along the southeast corridor was of high quality, this severely limited options for where new housing developments could be accommodated.

On the matter of Nitrate Mitigation; Mr Bushell informed the Committee the proposed mitigation was at Chilgrove Farm, the land which would be taken out of production was classified as grade 3. Monitoring of the site would be undertaken by the South Downs National Park and paid for by the developer.

On the matter of the size of the Community Hall; Mr Bushell explained how Community Hall had come about, it was designed to complement existing facilities within the area and meet the needs of the new community at the site. As detailed in the draft S106 agreement the hall would need to be delivered by the time occupation of the 250th dwelling took place.

With regards to street trees; Mr Bushell showed the Committee the proposed landscaping plan, he explained officers had worked with the developer to improve the greening of the development. From no trees being located on streets there were now several trees located throughout. Officers were satisfied with the proposal.

On the matter of cycling; Mr Bushell assured the Committee the development would not impact the delivery of the Chemroute, with a cycle priority junction included as part of the access to the site.

With regards to secondary access to the site; Mr Bushell explained the access was temporary and formed part of the construction management plan. However, he acknowledged the concerns made regarding unauthorised vehicle use and agreed an amendment could be made to Condition 31 to ensure that once the show home and construction use of the access had ceased measures could be made to prevent unauthorised non-emergency vehicular access.

On the issue of the management of the open space provision; Mr Bushell informed the Committee that it would be dealt with through the S106 agreement, including the provision of litter bins and play equipment.

With regards to restricting the amount of Affordable Housing provided; Mr Bushell confirmed there was a clause within the draft S106 to limit the affordable housing provision to 30% maximum, this would be policy compliant.

In response to concerns regarding access to the ditch on the western boundary; Mr Bushell informed the Committee, that a separate swale would be located 3m from

the ditch, to prevent the existing ditch from becoming overloaded. The swale had been located to ensure adequate access to the existing ditch for maintenance purposes. Condition 9 of the report secured appropriate riparian responsibilities. Mr Bushell advised the word 'existing' be added to Condition 9 as follows; '...of any *existing* watercourse...' to provide further clarity.

Mr Bushell agreed an informative could be included to prevent the ingress of surface and ground water, and to supplement Condition 10.

On the matter of the A27 and developer contributions; Ms Bell informed the Committee it had been confirmed the developer contribution would be the most up to date at the time of signing the S106 agreement.

With regards to education provision; Ms Bell explained WSCC education assessed all development being brought forward, alongside allocations in the Local Plan to plot school allocations and future placement. She informed the Committee that she had met with officers to understand where capacity was needed, with an expansion planned at Southbourne Primary school to meet demand from new development. Ms Bell informed the proposed development did not require a new school to be delivered.

In response to concerns regarding the developments impact on the dark skies area; Mr Bushell drew attention to Condition 30 which prevented streetlights, apart from at the main access onto the A259 for safety.

On the matter of solar panels; Ms Bell explained it would be unlikely the orientation of certain dwellings in the development would not be suitable for solar panel installation. She suggested an informative be added which gave future purchasers the opportunity to request solar panels as part of the build.

In addition, Ms Stevens confirmed the proposal went above the required building regulations in respect of sustainability measures proposed and was policy compliant. Therefore, the council could not insist Solar Panels were installed on all dwellings, however, the informative could be included on the decision.

On the matter of a future service charge being levied; Mr Bushell confirmed there would be a service charge to cover future maintenance costs.

On the matter of how much 'weight' could be given to the Bosham Neighbourhood Plan; Mrs Potts explained that in line with paragraph 14 of the NPPF the Bosham Neighbourhood Plan was over two years old and did not carry the same weight as other policy.

Having listened to the debate Cllr Briscoe proposed the application be deferred for a site visit. In addition, he requested WSCC highways attend Committee when the application is brought back to further explain the impact on the local road network and, for an updated comment from Southern Water.

Cllr Brisbane seconded the proposal

The Chairman requested that if the application were deferred officers relook at the proposed football pitch and liaise with Bosham Football Club and update the proposed conditions.

Cllr Oakley asked that the size and orientation of the community building was also reconsidered.

Following a vote, the Committee voted in favour of Cllr Briscoe's proposal to **Defer for a site visit**.

Resolved; **defer for a site visit**.

**Members took a ten-minute break*

**Cllr Oakley left the meeting at 11.50*

19 **BO/22/01550/FUL & BO/22/00876/LBC - Bosham Sailing Club The Quay Quay Meadow Bosham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8LU**

Miss Smith presented the report to Committee. She drew the Committees attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included; an addendum to the report reflecting that the Chichester Harbour Conservancy had no objection to the LBC application; additional representations which had been received; an amendment to Condition 4 and the inclusion of a new condition to ensure blinds are installed to protect the dark skies this would be included in application **BO/22/01550/FUL**.

Miss Smith highlighted the site location. She informed the Committee that it was located within the Bosham Conservation area and the Chichester Harbour AONB and the impact on both had been considered as part of the recommendation.

Miss Smith confirmed the development fell within Flood Zone 3 and that Annexe 3 of the NPPF wets out flood risk vulnerability classification. The development falls within the water-compatible classification, specifically water-based recreation and was considered acceptable. In addition, the applicant had agreed to include a water exclusion strategy.

The Committee were shown drawings of the site, Miss Smith explained the marquee which was currently in situ was an unlawful development. The new development would replace the marquee.

Miss Smith showed the Committee the proposed elevation, she highlighted the new dormer window and the spiral staircase.

The following representations were received;
Mr Ashley Hatton (Manor of Bosham & the Hundred Ltd) – Objector
Mr Paddy Mirams & Mr Alistair Langhorn – Supporters

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

In response to concerns regarding the impact on the dark new skies; Cllr Purnell drew the Committee's attention to the additional condition proposed on the update sheet which required blinds to be drawn between the hours from dusk till dawn.

On the matter of the blinds and light spillage at first floor level; Miss Smith confirmed there would be no blinds over the doors onto the balcony. However, condition 5 (page 87) prevented any external illumination from being installed without planning permission in order to avoid light spillage.

Regarding the proposed use and hours of operation; Miss Smith confirmed a condition could be added to restrict the hours of use. On the issue of a condition being imposed to restrict who could use the venue Miss Smith advised this would not be reasonable, given the existing use of the building.

In response to concerns regarding overlooking; Miss Smith confirmed the issue of overlooking of neighbouring properties had been fully considered by officers as part of the report.

On the matter of the public consultation the Chairman used their discretion and invited Mr Mirams from the public gallery to confirm who had been invited; Mr Mirams confirmed the consultation was held in the Sailing Club and was open to members of the public.

Following a vote on **BO/22/01550/FUL**, the Committee voted in favour of the report recommendation to **Permit**.

Resolved; **permit** subject to the following conditions and informatives set out in the report, plus the amendment to Condition 4 to secure blinds, the inclusion of Condition 6 as set out in the Agenda Update Sheet, and the additional condition, as discussed, to restrict the hours of use.

Following a vote on **BO/22/00876/LBC**, the Committee voted in favour of the report recommendation to **Permit**.

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

20 **BI/22/01742/FUL - Chichester Marina Birdham Chichester West Sussex PO20 7EJ**

Miss Taylor presented the report to Committee. She drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which set out amendments to paragraphs 3.1 and 8.2.

Miss Taylor informed the Committee the application was being submitted under Section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to amend condition 3 of

previous planning permission 12/00475/FUL. She explained what had been approved originally and how the current application sought permission to increase the floor area of building D by 121sqm.

Miss Taylor showed the Committee the site layout and drew their attention to building D. She highlighted the difference between what had been permitted and the extension being sought.

Miss Taylor explained the building had been vacant since April 2022. The proposal would allow building D to have a mixed-use café/restaurant and was supported by the Economic Development team.

Miss Taylor confirmed the impact on the Chichester Harbour AONB had been considered and there had been no objections.

The following representations were received;
Mr Matt Boyle – Applicant

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

On the matter of cycle parking provision; the chairman used their discretion to allow Cllr Hamilton (as a Birdham Parish Councillor) to answer. Cllr Hamilton confirmed there were places to securely store a bicycle.

No further comments were made.

Following a vote, the Committee voted in favour of the report recommendation for to **Permit**.

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

21 **SY/21/02895/FUL - The Boulevard 3 New Parade High Street Selsey
Chichester West Sussex PO20 0QA**

Mr Mew presented the report to Committee. He explained the application had been deferred at the Planning Committee on 10 August 2022, for further negotiations with the applicant, regarding the proposed material, lighting, and depth of guttering.

Mr Mew highlighted the site location and showed the Committee photos of the site and the structure. He confirmed negotiations had taken place and detailed the proposed amendments to the application.

The following representations were received;
Mr Andrew Brown – Selsey Town Council
Mr Matthew Pickup – Agent

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

In response to concerns regarding the impact of noise; Mr Mew informed the Committee that it was important to note the structure had been in place since June 2021. During that period no noise complaints had been made. There had been some antisocial behaviour complaints in the local area, but these were not associated with the business.

With regards to access being restricted by the structure; Mr Mew explained the Committee must make their determination on what was there at present and confirmed access requirements had been met.

In response to concerns regarding the materials used and their impact on the surrounding area; Mr Mew drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 8.6 which detailed the proposed amendments to the structure, which would reduce the impact of the metal roof.

Following a vote, the Committee rejected the report recommendation to permit the application.

Cllr Johnson proposed the application be refused on the grounds that it was not in keeping with the surrounding area and would have a negative impact on the street scene, which can be seen from the conservation area

Cllr Fowler seconded the proposal.

Following a vote, the Committee voted in favour of the Cllr Johnson's proposal to **refuse** the application for the reasons set out above.

Resolved; **refuse, against officer recommendation**, for the reasons set out above.

22 **WR/21/02064/FUL - Land South Of Dunhurst Barn Skiff Lane Wisborough Green West Sussex**

Mr Mew presented the report to Committee. He drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update sheet which included an amendment to Condition 6 and 10.

Mr Mew outlined the site location; he highlighted the sites proximity to the nearest residential dwelling and; drew attention to the bridleway which passed near to the site and the ancient woodland which bordered the site

Mr Mew explained the application was for the construction of six stables and a manege. He showed a proposed layout of the stable design along with a cross section of the proposed manege. The development was for the applicant's own horses.

Mr Mew informed the Committee it was the applicant's intention to graze part of the land and use the remaining land to produce hay which would feed the horses. Mr Mew highlighted the different areas of land to the Committee.

The following representations were received;
Mr Mark Tanner – Objector
Ms Hannah McLaughlin – Agent

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

Regarding how visible the site was from the bridleway; Mr Mew explained the site would be well screened from existing vegetation and was not expected to have any visual impact.

On the matter of agricultural land classification; Mr Mew informed the Committee the land was classified as Grade 3 agricultural land. In addition; Ms Golding clarified that the grazing of horses was classified as agricultural.

In response to concerns regarding surface water run-off; Mr Mew informed the Committee that the drainage matters had been part of detailed discussion with both CDC and Natural England. Condition 4 secured the drainage details and was included to protect local watercourses and ensure adequate surface water drainage was provided. Mr Mew provided further details of the proposed drainage and explained how surface water would be stored below ground in tanks which would be emptied by a specialist contractor.

On the matter of the muck heap; Mr Mew highlighted the location of where the muck heap was proposed and explained how run off would be collected in the proposed underground storage tanks.

With regards to Policy 55 of the Local Plan; Ms Stevens acknowledged concerns raised regarding the 'loss of agricultural land', however, she confirmed Policy 55 was accepting of equestrian development and reminded the Committee the land could be brought out of active agricultural use at any point.

In response to the future use of the development; Mr Mew drew the Committee's attention to Condition 10 (page 145) which prevented the commercial use of the development, he agreed the Condition could be amended to state in addition its use would be associated with the occupation of the house.

With regards to permitted development rights; Mr Mew explained there were no permitted development rights associated with the development. Any proposed future development would require a further planning application.

In response to concern regarding outside storage; Mr Mew agreed a Condition could be included (if permitted) to restrict the outside storage.

On the matter of the proposed inclusion of a bat brick; Mr Mew agreed Condition 7 would be amended to ensure it could be accommodated within the proposed elevations.

On the matter of storing hay and hay-making; Mr Mew highlighted the two storage barns which were included as part of the development. With regards to hay-making, this was an agricultural operation and outside the scope of the planning application.

Following a vote, the Committee voted in favour of the report recommendation for to **Permit**.

Resolved; **permit**, subject to the report conditions and informatives. Plus; the amendments to Condition 6 and 10 as set out in the Agenda Update Sheet and; an additional condition to prevent external storage; an amendment to Condition 10 to link the development with the house and an amendment to Condition 7 regarding the siting of the bat box.

**Members took a five-minute break*

**Cllr Johnson left the meeting at 3.45pm*

23

WW/22/01646/FUL - Land North-East Of The Truffles Piggery Hall Lane West Wittering West Sussex PO20 8PZ

Mr Thomas presented the report to Committee. He drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included; an additional comment from the CDC Tree Officer and additional conditions 12, 13 and 14.

Mr Thomas outlined the site location and explained the site was located within the Parish of West Wittering, approximately 1.6km from the village.

The Committee was shown a proposed site plan, Mr Thomas drew the Committee's attention to the proposed access arrangements and highlighted where the shepherds huts would be located. He explained the field was well screened and would have minimal visual impact.

Mr Thomas explained the proposed huts were constructed on site to a high development standard. The Committee were shown photos of the shepherds huts.

The following representations were received;

Cllr Bill Buckland – West Wittering Parish Council

Dr Peter Collinson – Objector

Ms Joanne Gilhooly – Objector

Mr Chris Aston – Supporters

Mrs Kerry Simmons – Applicant

Before opening the discussion, the Chairman used their discretion to read out a statement from Cllr Barrett in his absence.

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

In response to concerns regarding the boundary between the site and field; Mr Thomas explained there was a small post and rail fence, but an additional condition could be included to ensure the whole site was enclosed. Committee members asked that in addition to fencing, hedgerow planting could also be incorporated, Mr Thomas agreed this was not unreasonable and could be included as part of the condition.

In response to concerns that further shepherds huts would be brought on to the site; Mr Thomas informed the Committee that Condition 9 would limit the number of huts allowed on the site to two, it would also prevent tented and any other form of accommodation from being brought on to the site.

On the matter of policy; Mr Thomas confirmed the NPPF carried more weight than the Village Design Statement, although it was a material consideration.

On the matter of future subdivision of the field; Mr Thomas explained that any change of use or subdivision would require a separate planning application.

With regards to visitors using the wider field; Ms Stevens explained the wider field was not part of the application. As discussed, an additional condition to include more fencing and hedge on the boundary of the application site would assist in preventing visitors from accessing the wider field, an informative could be included to remind the applicant visitors should not access the wider field.

In response to concerns regarding the use of fire pits and BBQ's; Ms Stevens advised an additional condition could be included, requiring the applicant to submit a detailed management plan which would address the use of equipment such as bbqs and firepits and ensure they would be safely managed. The management plan would also be expected to include 'quiet hours' to limit impact from noise and late nights.

On the matter of nitrate mitigation; Mr Thomas explained there was no requirement for nitrate mitigation. Foul water would be collected in waste tanks which would be pumped to a central tank (used by the main house) where it would be tankered away.

Following a vote, the Committee voted in favour of the report recommendation for to **Permit**.

Resolved; **permit**, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report; along with the additional conditions 12, 13 and 14 detailed in the Agenda Update Sheet and the condition to fence and hedge the site, the condition to produce a management plan and an informative regarding the wider use of the field.

**Members took a five-minute break*

**Cllr Fowler left the meeting at 3.25pm*

SDNP SO/21/02183/FUL - Green Lanes Farm Back Lane Forestside Stoughton PO9 6EB

Mr Saunders presented the report to Committee. He drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included a further comment from the Landscape Team.

Mr Saunders explained the application was for the demolition of an existing 'chalet style' office and construction of a replacement farm office. He outlined the site location, which was within the Parish of Stoughton and confirmed all land within the blue line was within the control of the applicant. The proposed development would be located in the area identified by the red line. The site was already well screened by existing vegetation.

Mr Saunders provided a brief summary of the farming enterprise which operated from the site and why a larger office facility was being sought.

The following representations were received;

Mrs Lysaght – Objector

Sue Montila – Objector

Mr Michael Conoley (on behalf of Caroline Tipper) – Objector

Mr Jack Stilwell – Applicant.

The Chairman asked Mr Saunders to respond to some of the comments made by some of the speakers.

Mr Saunders confirmed that in 2018 retrospective planning permission had been given for the siting of two containers (located in the NE of the site) and two agricultural barns. He confirmed the landscaping condition had been discharged.

Mr Saunders confirmed the building would at no time have a first floor or mezzanine and drew the Committee's attention to Condition 5 on page 173. If an additional floor were required at a future date a full planning application would be required.

Officers responded to Members comments and questions as follows;

In response to concerns regarding the removal of the containers; Mr Saunders drew members attention to Condition 7 (on page 173), he suggested the condition could be amended to include the word 'permanent' as follows '*...the complete and permanent removal*'. The Committee agreed this amendment if permitted.

Mr Saunders confirmed enforcement officers had previously visited the site. However, officers had worked with the applicant and retrospective applications had been made, as was entirely within their right. He reminded the Committee the application they were considering was not a retrospective application.

In response to concerns regarding the future use of the development; Mr Saunders agreed a Condition (if permitted) could be included that would require the removal of the building should it no longer be required.

To answer a question of regarding the extent of the concrete base at the site Chairman used their discretion and invited the applicant to confirm. The applicant confirmed neither of the containers were stored on a concrete base, the current office was on a concrete base and this would be incorporated within the new development.

With regards to the use of a comma in Condition 7; Mr Saunders agreed if permitted the comma could be removed to read as follows; '*...removed from the site together with...*'

Following a vote, the Committee voted in favour of the report recommendation to **Permit**.

Resolved; **permit**, subject to the report conditions and informatives, as well as the agreed amendments to Condition 7 (inclusion of the word permanent and the removal of the comma) and the inclusion of a new condition requiring the removal of the building should it no longer be required as a farm office.

** Members took a five-minute break.*

**Cllr Bowden left the meeting at 4pm*

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

Ms Stevens drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included an update on High Court Hearings for the site; Land at Flat Farm, Broad Road, Hambrook, West Sussex, PO18 8FT.

Cllr Potter asked if a new appeal had been lodged for the Bethwines Farm proposal. Ms Stevens confirmed there had.

The Committee agreed to note the item.

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

Cllr Wilding asked for an update on the appeal for SDNP/21/01971/FUL – Abesters Quell. Mr Saunders informed the Committee the matter was with PINS for consideration.

The Committee agreed to note the item.

27 **Schedule of Contraventions**

Mrs Archer introduced the report. She drew the Committee's attention to the table set out on page 203 and highlighted the reduction in case numbers since the last report.

Cllr Briscoe noted the positive impact from a recent Article 4 direction and enquired if this was a tool which could be used more commonly to support enforcement. Mrs Archer acknowledged the comments but explained that an Article 4 Direction is not an enforcement tool, it is used to supplement and support policy.

In response to a question from Cllr Oakley regarding trends, Mrs Archer informed the Committee case numbers remained consistent averaging around 500 per year. However, the level of customer interest and expectation had increased.

Cllr Purnell thanked the Enforcement Team.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed to note the item.

28 Consideration of any late items as follows:

There were no late items.

29 Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no part two items.

30 Agenda Update Sheet - 09.11.2022

The meeting ended at 4.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date: