

**Report following a request for further information, negotiations or consultation**

REF NO: BE/109/19/OUT

LOCATION: Land east of Shripney Road & south of Haddan House  
Shripney Road Bersted

PROPOSAL: Outline application with some matters reserved for up to 46 No dwellings together with access. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan & may affect the character and appearance of the Shripney Conservation Area.

Contrary to officer's advice and recommendation, it was resolved to refuse the application at the meeting on 3 June. Only Cllr Coster spoke on reasons for refusal which were seconded by Cllrs Thurston and Hamilton. However, the comments from Cllr Coster were extensive and in a form of a list of issues rather than reasons and the application was therefore deferred in order to allow officers an opportunity to formulate some suggested reasons for refusal based on this list for the Committee to consider.

Cllr Coster's comments in full were;

'On the basis that it is contrary to number of Local Plan policies. For example.

- TSP 1 (f2). Site has to have access to high quality public transport services. Which It does not.
- T DM1 (b) Proposals for new development must contribute to the extension of public transport service to serve the development. There is no commitment in this to serve the development at all.
- C SP1, SD SP2 Outside BUAB's and doesn't fall into any exception categories.
- Bersted NP ES7 ditto.
- SO DM1 Best and most versatile land grade 2. Development will not be permitted unless the need for the devt out weights the need to protect such land. Also, not permitted if the applicant has not submitted the necessary reports, which they have not.
- SD SP1 claim this supports sustainable development only on the condition that will contribute to the social, economic and environmental conditions south the National Park. This development does not contribute to any of these.
- Its also in conflict with the NPPF paragraphs 110, which refers to high quality public transport which is not present there, and it doesn't address the needs for people with disabilities and reduced mobility. It's also 117, 118, 122(c), 127(f) and 155 as I mentioned before about that it has to avoid flooding or has to be made safe for its lifetime. 155 is important.
- And the future effects of climate change 157(d), 158, 160, 161. There is a lot of aspects there that it can be refused under.
- This development has very limited social, economic and environmental benefits and they don't do anything to outweigh the clear harm that this development will do to the village of Shripney and potential users of this development.'

Officers have worded reasons for refusal for the Committee to consider around these comments (as there were no other comments made by members).

(1) The proposals have limited economic, social and environmental benefits and result in clear harm to the village of Shripney. The site lacks access to high quality public transport, is outside of the built-up area and the benefits of the proposals do not outweigh the harm. The

proposals are contrary to policies C SP1 and SD SP1 of the Arun Local Plan, Policy ES7 of the Bersted Neighbourhood Plan and the guidance within the NPPF.

(2) The proposed development fails to address the flood risk requirements associated with future climate change in the longer term and is contrary to paragraph 155, 157, 158, 160 and 161 of the NPPF.

(3) The proposed development is on land defined as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 2). As the benefits of the proposals do not outweigh and the applicant has not submitted reports required within policy SO DM1 of the Arun Local Plan, the proposals are therefore contrary to this policy.

Officer advice at the meeting was clear in that;

- A site a matter of a few metres from this site was found to be sustainable development in accordance with NPPF and policy SD SP1 only two weeks ago and there were no reasons forthcoming as to why a different conclusion should be reached. If committee were to attach this as a reason for refusal, then they would be required to demonstrate exceptional reasons why a different conclusion has been reached, or face the inevitable conclusions of being unreasonable with consequential costs against the Council.

- The matter of soils and policy SO DM1 was not referred to by any member during the lengthy debate on this application. It would therefore be unreasonable to refuse the application on this ground as this was not an issue stated as being of concern by any member at the meeting.