DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

2 September 2020 at 2.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chair), B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Charles, Coster, Mrs Hamilton, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Pendleton, Roberts, Tilbrook, Mrs Warr and Mrs Yeates

173. APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence had been received from Councillor Edwards.

174. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Planning Application LU/149/20/PL – Councillor Mrs Yeates declared a prejudicial interest as the proposal came under the remit of her portfolio as Cabinet Member for Community Wellbeing.

Planning Application BN/39/20/PL - Councillor Ms Thurston declared a personal interest as a member of Barnham & Eastergate Parish Council.

175. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 29 July 2020 were approved by the Committee as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman as soon as possible following the Council's resumption of normal working.

176. BN/39/20/PL, LAND ADJACENT TO TARS FARM HOUSE, CHURCH LANE, BARNHAM PO22 0DB

Public Speakers: Barnham & Eastergate Parish Council
Mr G. Fields, Objector
Mr P. Barry, Agent

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Ms Thurston had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

BN/39/20/PL – Erection of 4 No. dwellings & associated works. This application is a departure from the Development Plan, Land adjacent to Tars Farm House, Church Lane, Barnham

The Committee received a report on the detail of this application from the Principal Planner, together with an officer report update which provided additional information relating to refuse collection; surface water drainage from the site; and the need for an additional condition in respect of the control of new ground and floor levels across the site.

In considering the proposal, the Committee participated in a full debate. Some Members expressed their opposition as it was felt that the rural character of the area would be lost; the lane was not suitable for the additional traffic that would be generated; the sloping nature of the plot was of concern; doubts were expressed about the drainage measures to be put in place; and comment was made that the requirement for an odour assessment and mitigation measures to address the odour from the nearby stables was not practical.

However, other Members acknowledged that the Council's position with regard to the current 5 year Housing Land Supply deficit meant that all housing development in the district was needed to address the shortfall. Regret was expressed that, whilst there were issues with the proposal, there were no planning reasons to refuse it. The Principal Planning Officer was commended for his work on the application and for the comprehensive conditions that would be attached to any approval.

The Principal Planning Officer addressed issues raised by Members in the course of the debate, following which the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update.

177. EP/67/20/PL, LAND ADJACENT TO 45 THE RIDINGS, EAST PRESTON BN16 2TW

Public Speaker: Mr P. Brown, Supporter

EP/67/20/PL – 1 No. detached house & formation of associated new access, Land adjacent to 45 The Ridings, East Preston

Having received a report on the matter, Member concern with regard to overlooking was addressed by the Planning Team Leader and the Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

178. FG/6/20/PL HANGLETON FARM LIVERY STABLES, WADARS ANIMAL RESCUE CENTRE, HANGLETON LANE, FERRING BN12 6PP

Public Speakers: Mr G. Fox, Objector
Mrs K. Osborne-Shaw, Objector
Mrs J. Toben, Applicant
Mrs T. Cadman, Supporter

FG/6/20/PL – Development of Animal Rescue Centre, to include new buildings for reception, training & education, cattery, kennels & associated ancillary accommodation, conversion of existing barn into staff accommodation along with driveways, car parking & landscaping. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, Hangleton Farm Livery Stables, Wadars Animal Rescue Centre, Hangleton Lane, Ferring

The Planning Team Leader presented this report, together with the officer's written report update detailing:-

- Comments from the National Park Authority and suggested additional condition relating to the use of external lighting
- The applicant's request that condition 8 be amended to delete reference to the isolation unit and that the number of dogs to be housed there did not exceed 1
- An additional drawing and information submitted by the Agent detailing boundary fencing and the extent of green metal fencing between the kennels
- No new points had been raised in additional representations received since publication of the agenda
- Officer response to the foregoing and amended condition sheet

In opening up the debate, a Member suggestion was made that a site visit might be appropriate in light of comments from the objectors but, during the course of consideration, this was not supported as there were no animals at the site at the present time. Officer clarification was given that the applicant did already have planning approval for the kennelling of dogs at the site and permission was in place for them to be exercised outside.

A further suggestion was made that any permission might be time limited to enable the matter to be revisited to address any adverse issues that might arise. However, the Group Head of Planning was of the view that that would be unreasonable as the charity would have to make a substantial investment for the work to be carried out.

Member comment was made that what was being proposed would be purpose built and the measures being put in place should not cause nuisance. The Committee therefore

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update.

179. LU/149/20/PL, LITTLEHAMPTON WAVE, SEA ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON BN16 2NA

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Mrs Yeates had declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting so took no part in the debate or vote.

In the course of discussion, Councillor Blanchard-Cooper declared a personal interest as he knew the sculptor through a separate project he was involved in. He remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

LU/149/20/PL – Installation of a 4m high timber sculpture shaped in the form of 3 No. waves, fixed to a concrete base. This application is not CIL liable (Zero Rated) as "all other development", Littlehampton Wave, Sea Road, Littlehampton

In presenting this report, together with the officer's written report update detailing an additional representation received and the officer response, the Planning Team Leader reminded the Committee that this was a Council application.

The Committee considered the proposal and, whilst welcoming the principle for an artwork at the front of Littlehampton Wave, this particular design was unanimously rejected as it was felt it did not represent waves and its angular nature would provide an opportunity for the youth to use it as a climbing frame.

Following consideration, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The sculptures, by reason of their design will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policies DSP1 and DDM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

180. F/15/20/WS, FORD CIRCULAR TECHNOLOGY PARK, FORD ROAD, FORD BN18 0XL

F/15/20/WS - Demolition of existing buildings and structures and construction and operation of an energy recovery facility and a waste sorting and transfer facility for treatment of municipal, commercial and industrial wastes, including ancillary buildings, structures, parking, hardstanding and landscape works. This application is a County Waste Matter and will be determined by West Sussex County Council, Ford Circular Technology Park, Ford Road, Ford

The Principal Planner presented the detail of this proposal, together with the officer's written report update setting out the steer that had been put forward by the Yapton, Ford and Clymping Advisory Group meeting held on 25 August 2020. The Advisory Group had supported the officer recommendation to object but wished reasons for the objection, as set out in the officer update, to be forwarded to West Sussex County Council.

In discussing the matter, very strong views were expressed that this application was not acceptable and the views of the Yapton, Ford and Clymping Advisory Group were supported. It was also proposed and agreed that a further reason be added to the objection relating to this Council's strategic sites allocation in the Local Plan and the Arun Strategic Transport Assessment, the wording being: -

> The proposal would be detrimental to the Local Authority's ability to deliver on the strategic sites detailed in the Adopted and therefore statutory Local Plan, both in terms of the quantum of housing and the Arun Strategic Transport assessment.

Particular issues raised in the debate centred around: -

- This site had an existing planning permission for a recycling plant and that had been taken into account by the Planning Inspector when considering Arun's Local Plan for adoption. The strategic allocations across the District had been agreed and this proposal would be detrimental to those, particularly in Ford. Who would want to build or live so close to such a development?
- The Transport Assessment undertaken by Arun had assumed that the existing planning permission for a recycling plant would be implemented, therefore if the proposal on the table went through that assessment would have to be revisited. The Arun Transport Study: Waste Site Allocation Transport Addendum 2014, Paragraph 2.3.2 was quoted and it was highlighted that that was a Policy Statement of the County Council, which they now appeared to be disregarding.
- Noise pollution; light pollution; harmful emissions; heavy traffic movements; the size of facility which would cause damage to the immediate landscape, including the South Downs National Park and the coastal plain.
- The Council had already accepted that a waste facility would be built on the site but what was now being proposed would cause irreparable damage to the District's tourism.
- The County Council had chosen not to go ahead with a site which already had planning permission and, furthermore, the site at Horsham had been passed at appeal. Two sites were therefore available and it was unacceptable that Ford should now be considered suitable to be the destination for the waste for the whole of the South East of England.
- It had been stated that the energy to be produced would be going to the National Grid and a proposal to sink cables all the way to Chichester would not be practical or economically viable.
- The highway infrastructure was totally inadequate to support the proposal and any such facility needed to be much closer to A roads and major routes. Comment was made that routing agreements were in place between County Highways and local businesses to ensure traffic used the A259 to go east and west to protect areas such as Arundel. A facility such as this proposal would normally be situated with a 360 degree access, which Ford clearly did not have.
- The environmental statement needed to more strongly support the objection in respect of key emissions; night noise; underlying noise of fans, etc; the detrimental impact of nitrous oxide; and the inadequate flue cleansing mechanism that was proposed.

- It was suggested that a site with a good rail network would be more suitable.

Early in the debate it had been formally proposed and seconded that, should the County Council be minded to approve the application, then Arun District Council would apply to the Secretary of State to call-in the application. It was confirmed that would be added as a separate recommendation to the Council's response to West Sussex County Council.

The Committee then

RESOLVED – That

(1) An objection be raised based on the officer's report, the comments from the Yapton, Ford and Clymping Advisory Group, the issues raised by Members and the following additional reason:-

The proposal would be detrimental to the Local Authority's ability to deliver on the strategic sites detailed in the Adopted and therefore statutory Local Plan, both in terms of the quantum of housing and the Arun Strategic Transport assessment; and

(2) Should the County Council be minded to approve the application, then Arun District Council would apply to the Secretary of State to call-in the application.

181. LIST OF APPEALS

The Committee received and noted the list of appeals that had been received.

(The meeting concluded at 5.40 pm)