

Planning Committee

9 July 2019 – At a meeting of the Planning Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester.

Present: Mr Crow (Chairman)

Mrs Kitchen, Lt Cdr Atkins, Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Jupp, Ms Lord, Mr McDonald, Mr S J Oakley, Mr Patel, Mrs Russell and Mr Simmons

Apologies were received from Mr Quinn

Absent: Lt Col Barton

Substitutes: None

Part I

1. Declarations of Interest

1.1 In accordance with the County Council's Code of Conduct, the following interests were declared:

- Mr Jupp declared a personal interest in application WSCC/004/19/RW – Rudgwick Brickworks as a councillor for Horsham District Council.

2. Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee

2.1 Resolved - That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 March 2019 be agreed as a correct record.

3. Urgent Matters

3.1 There were no urgent matters.

4. Planning Application: Waste

WSCC/004/19/RW Extension to the restoration of the former claypit, including the remodelling of the existing landform to enable a change of use to agricultural land (permanent pasture), internal traffic management improvement measures and a proposed scheme of landscaping improvements and ecological enhancement. Rudgwick Brickworks, Lynwick Street, Rudgwick, Horsham, RH12 3DH.

4.1 The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services, as amended by the agenda update sheet (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes). The report was introduced by James Neave, Principal Planner, who gave a presentation on the proposals, details of the consultation and key issues in respect of the application.

4.2 Mr Chris Whitehouse, NextPhase Development Ltd, agent for applicant. spoke in support of the application. The robustness of the committee report and grounds for refusal were questioned. The only technical assessment of landscape is the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), submitted as part of the application; this is not acknowledged or referenced in the Committee Report, however, it notes that the impacts on landscape and visual receptors will be temporary and restoration will provide beneficial change including a cohesive landform, an increase in tree cover and improved views. There is no justification or reason as to how and why the Planning Officer has drawn an alternative conclusion. Mr Whitehouse stated that the application is restoration and clearly accords with each of the nine criteria for Policy W8 of the Waste Local Plan (WLP).

4.3 Mr James McClean of Restoration to Agriculture (for the landowners, the Harrison family), the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The project is a gigantic recovery plan for 20 acres of abandoned, former clay pit and restoration of land to agricultural use to sustain existing farming operations. Only 23,000m³ of the 85,000m³ of inert waste mentioned in the report (25%) will be infill to steep agricultural land, which is dangerous in some weather. 75% of the application deals with topographical changes, ecological enhancements and traffic improvements within the existing extant site, which is where the rest of the imported material will be placed. The LVIA concludes the final landform will enhance views across the new meadows. Woodland is already threatened; 16 trees have Ash Die Back and will have to be removed. Bat surveys and checks have not noted bats in the 20 trees in the current woodland shaw; but mitigation measures and ecological enhancements have been developed anyway. Contrary to the Planning Officer's opinion, the applicant will use only the minimum amount of material necessary to achieve the objective; there will be no doming or mounding. Operations have been conducted for 4-years with no complaints or statutory interventions. The applicant has worked successfully with the liaison group and local community. The Parish Council and Rudgwick Preservation Society support the application.

4.4 Cllr Richard Landeryou, Horsham District Councillor for Rudgwick and a Rudgwick Parish Councillor (formerly Chairman during the first three years of the infill of the clay pit), spoke in support of the application. The landowners, whose farm is adjacent to the old Rudgwick Brickworks, have spent the last 4-years infilling the clay pit to return it to pasture for grazing. The adjacent land/field contains a steep slope where it meets the reclaimed land – it is a health and safety hazard for turning tractors and is unfarmable in some weather conditions. The proposal will eradicate the slope, bring it to the same level as the restored field and seamlessly joining the two fields, thereby bringing it back to agricultural use. Removal of trees, most with Ash Die Back, will be mitigated by strategic planting along the existing hedgerow and a new area of woodland, resulting in a net increase in tree numbers. Wetland will be enhanced. Farming operations will no longer need to use Lynwick Street; a benefit to residents and road users. The liaison group has addressed the original concerns about infill operations and traffic movements. The application is supported by the Parish Council and Rudgwick Preservation Society.

There are no substantial or technical objections, subject to replanting and wetland conditions being imposed.

4.5 The Chairman read out the following statement from local member, Christian Mitchell, member for Broadbridge who was unable to attend:

"I am unable to attend. But, please do record in the meeting that I support the application, which is contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

I have attended the Rudgwick Parish Council meeting tonight at 7pm [on 8 July 2019] and they support the application as correctly recorded in the report. They do not uphold the concerns that are set out in the report."

4.6 During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Planning Officers and Legal Officers, where appropriate:

Is the application considered recovery or disposal of waste

Points raised in favour of the application – this is a matter of interpretation of policy as to whether the proposal is recovery or disposal, and the applicant has proved that the application meets the criteria for Policy W8 of the WLP - that it does bring or restore land into beneficial agricultural use, some of which is steep and currently unusable. It was also stated that the Officer's assessment is academic rather than practical.

Response - Sections 9.2 to 9.22 of the Committee Report sets out the policy criteria and Officer's view which concludes the proposal is disposal, because it fails to satisfy the criteria of Policy W8. Principally it has not been demonstrated that the minimum amount of waste material would be used to achieve the benefits. The proposed infill of the extension area would not be considered restoration and should be seen as land-raising as it would change the existing landform by deposition of material on an area of land that is undeveloped. The infill of the former clay pit area is considered to be restoration because the extant permission will return the landform to as close as possible to what it was originally.

Points raised that support the recommendation to refuse - Policy W8 criteria are not fulfilled; the extension area is outside the original application site and so there is a lot of weight that can be given to the proposal being disposal of waste. There is a fundamental difference between this application and the existing permission. The infill to the north is greenfield not brownfield. The existing woodland was unlikely to ever have been in agricultural use. The objection by Horsham District Council was noted.

Response - The Committee Report sets out the benefits of the proposal, which have been weighed against the impacts.

Other points - The judgement as to whether the application meets policy W8 of the WLP (recovery) as opposed to policy W9 (disposal) is finely balanced. What is the minimum amount of waste that could be used for infill?

Response - Planning law requires a decision to be made in accordance with the development plan, which includes the waste local plan, unless material considerations suggest otherwise. In relation to the minimum volume for infill, it was the Officer's opinion that benefits could be achieved without the importation of the volume of waste proposed.

Landscape and ecology

Points raised – Concern was raised about the length of time it will take for new trees and vegetation to establish, noting that the existing understorey of vegetation below the trees is currently well established and that the WSCC Tree Officer has noted the loss of semi-mature oaks and vegetation. The impact of the loss of trees along the bat foraging route was noted, however the impact is lessened due to the low number of sightings. Clarification was sought on how long the woodland belt has been in existence; what the benefits referred to by Mr Whitehouse are, and whether there are there any preservation orders on the oak trees.

Response – Information is noted in paragraphs 9.11 and 9.20 of the Committee Report regarding habitat including the matter of replacement planting as well as the issues relating to Ash Die Back, ecology and bats. The WSCC Ecologist is satisfied with the proposals, subject to biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures. The woodland belt has been in existence since at least 1850 and so this part has not been in agricultural use since at least that time. Mr Whitehouse refers to the Combined Benefit Statement (available on the County Council's Planning website); it is acknowledged that the proposal has some benefits, which are summarised in paragraph 9.2 onwards of the Committee. There are no tree preservation orders on the oak trees.

Drainage - culvert

Point raised – How would drainage be affected and would the existing culvert be retained under the infill?

Response – The culvert will remain but will be buried under the infill. The WSCC Drainage Officer has concluded that the proposals are acceptable.

Weight given to assessments and consultees' views

Points raised – What weight has been given to the LVIA/technical assessments, and also the view of Horsham District Council?

Response - A review of the LVIA and other documents and assessment is undertaken by Officers and the views of consultees, including HDC (the objection was only confirmed recently), are sought and taken into account. Officers' conclusions are based on all information and consultee comments.

Support versus objections

Point raised – It was noted that the Horsham District Councillor supports the application in opposition to the view of Horsham District Council Officers. It was further noted that the Parish and County Councillor support the application as well. Also that Natural

England, the Environment Agency and local residents have not objected and it is clear that the Liaison Group feel listened to. Is lack of objection a material consideration?

Response – It is acknowledged that the site and the local liaison group are well run. The responses of consultees are considered; however, Officers did not feel this overrides the impacts or accordance with the development plan.

4.7 The substantive recommendation, subject to reasons for refusal as set out in Appendix 1, was proposed by Ms Lord and seconded by Mr S. Oakley and was put to the Committee and refused by a majority.

4.8 Mr Barrett-Miles proposed the following motion:

It has been demonstrated that, on balance, there is a genuine need to use the waste material and that the amount of material to be used would be no more than is necessary to deliver the suggested benefits. The site would be restored to a high quality standard and would be deemed to be acceptable with regard to impacts on the rural landscape. The development therefore, accords with Policy W8 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014).

On balance, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact upon the locality by introducing an acceptable landform into a rural landscape that would maintain or enhance the countryside and recognise its intrinsic value and the landscape character of the area. Thereby, according with Policies W8, W11 and W12 and W20 of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan (2014), Policies 25, 26 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (November 2015), and Paragraphs 127 and 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

And, that authority is delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-chairman of Planning Committee, to set conditions and informatives.

The proposal was seconded by Lt. Cdr. Atkins, and put to the Committee and approved by a majority.

4.9 Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and informatives, to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services and agreed in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-chairman of Planning Committee.

4.10 The Committee recessed at 11.42 a.m. The Committee reconvened at 11.55 a.m.

5. Planning Application: Waste

WSCC/037/19

Proposed Inert Waste Recycling Facility, with new building, hardstanding, car parking, boundary treatment and re-aligned access to the agricultural unit. Includes

variation to approved site landscaping and use of internal spaces within the existing Materials Recovery Facility. Envirowaste (Southern) Limited, Burndell Road, Yapton, West Sussex, BN18 0HR.

5.1 The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services, as amended by the agenda update sheet (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes). The report was introduced by Edward Anderson, Assistant Planner, who gave a presentation on the proposals, details of the consultation and key issues in respect of the application.

5.2 Cllr Henry Burrell of Clymping Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. Although it is on the former airfield, the site is in open countryside. The application meets none of the exemptions in the Arun Local Plan enabling development and fails to take account of Clymping Neighbourhood Plan. Noise and dust should be independently assessed. Concern was raised about health hazards and smaller dust particles and distance travelled, as well as lack of controls and the impact from cumulative development including the approved concrete batching plant and new housing. Cumulative development, including new housing, will also have an impact on traffic and road safety. The site is not designated in the WLP and so the need is questioned, especially in relation to the approved application for the Arun Waste inert waste plant in Clymping (WSPC/067/15/CM).

5.3 Cllr Amanda Worne, Arun District Councillor for Yapton (including Ford and Clymping), spoke in objection to the application. The health and safety of residents will be affected and the impact of dust on residents and children using gardens and also local wildlife was highlighted. It can't be guaranteed that dust won't spread - various local areas were noted as a concern, including the villages of Clymping, Yapton and Ford, the nearest residential property which is only 95m distant, the local school and the war memorial which is used for public gatherings. The doors to the plant will be open for 15 minutes every hour during concrete crushing so it can't be guaranteed that dust won't escape. Road safety concerns were raised regarding the increase in HGV numbers and the recent death of a local motorcyclist on Yapton Road following a collision with a HGV was cited. Concern was raised about the impact of noise levels - up to 110 decibels (dB) - which is unacceptable.

5.4 Mr Doug Maw, local resident and Parish Councillor for Yapton, spoke in objection to the application. The site has expanded its use and increased its capacity over the years; originally it was for waste cardboard and tyres and but is now used for hardcore and aggregates and the volume is now proposed to be 60,000 tonnes per annum; this is totally inappropriate in a rural location. The constant change of use means there is a danger of further change of use being allowed in future. The impacts of dust on nearby housing will affect residents and children; it is stated that 10% of dust will fall over 400m from the site - the school and other residential properties are within this distance. The application breaches the NFFP which promotes healthy and safe communities. HGVs drive through the village, close to housing, in breach of condition, and concern was raised about the impact of additional HGVs on already heavily used

roads. There have been breaches of operating hours including vehicle movements at 6.30 a.m., with the operating manager stating he was unaware of conditions. The noise assessment does not consider everything; for example noise from skips being dropped outdoors and vehicles reserving and moving around the site. The applicant should look for a more appropriate site.

5.5 Alison Crooks of Integrated Skills, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The volume of local objection is appreciated. The application is unique in being the first in the area to provide a fully closed facility for managing this waste stream. Typical sites are usually in the open and rely on methods such as noise bunds and spray irrigation to control noise and dust. The applicant is committed to ensuring their operations do not cause harm or nuisance. The facility is safeguarded in the WLP. Need for the site is proven; the closure of Portfield Quarry has created a deficit. This site is ideally located to support planned growth in Arun district both in terms of waste management and returning aggregates to construction, and it has existing infrastructure. Co-location supports sustainable waste management. The technical assessments, which included the cumulative impact of nearby developments, have been considered by statutory consultees and there is no objection from Environmental Health, Highways or the Environment Agency (EA) and the operation will be regulated by the later through the Environmental Permitting Regime to regulate noise and dust - the management plans for this will require approval by the EA.

5.6 Jacky Pendleton, member for Middleton, spoke on the application. There is the potential for severe noise and air pollution. Concrete crushing is a highly noisy and dust emitting operation. Crystalline silica can cause silicosis and cement is caustic, abrasive and drying and there are serious health risks associated with prolonged or repeated exposure to such airborne dust. High winds and the open vista mean a likelihood of dust being carried to homes. Large vehicles will access and egress close to residential properties. The very recent death of the motorcyclist, cited by Mrs Worne, was highlighted, noting the incident took place on Yapton Road which has no footpath. This site will only add to the number of large vehicles on the road with the resultant risks. The application should not be permitted in such rural setting. If the Committee does approve the application then there should be appropriate mitigation methods, e.g. a noise limit of 34 decibels, substantive acoustic screening around the whole site including better acoustic cladding on the building, improved planting which should be specified, filtered air extraction, clean air circulation inside to protect workers and an airlock system with no direct open exit doors.

5.7 In response to points made by speakers Planning Officers provided clarification, as follows - other points in relation to noise and impact on highways are covered in minute 5.8 below:

- The 110 dB mentioned by Mrs Worne would be the noise level inside the building. The noise assessment has been accepted by the Environmental Health Officer who feels that noise can be adequately controlled by condition and by the proposed mitigation measures, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report

including closure of doors during concrete crushing operations and acoustic insulation.

- In relation to traffic data and the death of the motorcyclist which was highlighted, the assessment took account of up-to-date information at the time, dating from 1 August 2013 to 31 July 2018. WSCC Highways are satisfied that data is as up to date as can reasonably be expected and that impact of the development on highways is acceptable.

5.8 During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Planning Officers, where applicable:

Noise

Points raised – It was queried why peak measurements have not been used, and the impacts of peak noise such as the dropping of skips when unloading were noted. It was stated that closure of the doors during crushing operations may not satisfactorily mitigate the impacts. Clarification was sought regarding whether the removal of the bund has been taken into account, and also what the measurements for the average dB increase are.

Response – Noise has been assessed at different times and it takes into account the removal of the bund, closure of the door during concrete crushing operations and other attenuation measures. The Noise Assessment shows there would be an increase of 1dB above the ambient noise at a number receptor points in the locality, which were highlighted to the Committee. The resulting increase would not be impactful.

Dust

Points raised – Concern was raised about the absence of technical data regarding the measurement and impacts of dust, including that closing the doors during crushing operations may not satisfactorily mitigate the impacts. Clarification was sought regarding the following: whether there is suitable expertise to judge if the proposed dust mitigation scheme (which is to be approved before commencement of the development); if the dust that falls outside would be included within the scheme/condition; whether the proposal is in line with industry standards for escaping dust; and if the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is satisfied with dust control measures inside the building to protect workers.

Response – It is acknowledged that the site will produce dust, and that around 10% of dust will settle over 400m from the site. Airborne dust would be included in the proposed mitigation scheme, which will require approval from Environmental Health Officers at Arun District Council, who are the one of the experts. Additionally, the applicant must operate under the Environment Agency's Environmental Permitting Regime, which is monitored and enforced by them. Furthermore, there is a condition requiring sheeting of vehicles leaving the site. Considerations of worker health and safety are a matter for HSE and outside of the planning process.

Impact on highways

Points raised – Clarification was sought regarding the following: whether the Traffic Assessment took into account the upcoming increases in residential traffic from allocated sites and also industrial use, and why the variation is to allow HGVs to leave at 07.00 (Monday-Friday) when site operations don't start until 08.00.

Response – The data used for the Transport Assessment takes into account current and proposed development. The variation in start time for HGV movements aims to lessen the impact on highways at peak traffic time in the morning.

Removal of the bund and replacement planting

Point raised – The area set aside for planting on the south-eastern boundary, after the removal of the bund, does not appear to be wide enough for planting of trees of a substantive size sufficient enough to soften the impact of the building. Clarification was sought on what will happen to the material contained in the bund following removal.

Response – Because the site is distant from the road it will not be a prominent feature in the landscape and proposed planting would have only a limited screening effect, given the scale of buildings. Agreed pre-commencement condition 7 – Planting Scheme requires the scheme of planting to be secured prior to commencement of the development; the scheme will require approval by the WSCC Tree Officer. The north-eastern boundary may be suitable for mature trees. The applicant is a licensed waste operator and, whilst it is not specified what will happen to the material in the bund, they should be able to adequately manage it.

Stockpiles

Points raised – Clarification was sought on whether stockpiles outside will be allowed. An additional condition preventing outside stockpiles should be included.

Response – Bays for storage would be allowed, as they currently are, along with storage for skips.

Drainage

Point raised – The verbal update on drainage was requested, as referred to on page 61 of the committee report.

Response – The agreed pre-commencement condition 3 – Surface Water Disposal requires the drainage scheme to be secured prior to commencement of the development; this will require approval by the WSCC Drainage Officer.

Need for the development

Points raised – It is also noted that Bognor Road Fuel Depot is allocated in the WLP but unused, so clarification was sought on this.

Response – The site at Bognor Road has outline planning permission which requires the inclusion of waste site but details have not yet been provided, so it would not meet the tests regarding availability under Policy W10 of the WLP. Also, it is a small site in a different setting, being next to a hotel and shopping area and closer to

residential properties and so is unsuitable for the kind of operation proposed in this application.

Liaison Group

Point raised – A liaison group was suggested to help address community concerns.

Response – It is for Committee members to consider whether the requirement for a liaison group would be proportionate.

5.9 Mr S. Oakley proposed a new condition as follows:

Stockpiles

No stockpiles of materials shall be permitted outside of the building, excluding skips.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

The proposal was seconded by Mr Barrett-Miles and was voted on by the Committee and approved by a majority.

5.10 The substantive recommendation, as amended by the agenda update sheet and changes to conditions, as agreed by the Committee, was proposed by Mr Crow and seconded by Mrs Kitchen and was put to the Committee and approved by a majority.

5.10 Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to:

- (a) amended conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the report, as agreed by the Committee, and
- (b) the applicant entering into a legal agreement under section 106 and s106a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) to maintain agreed routing of traffic to/from the south, avoiding Yapton village.

5.12 The Committee recessed at 1.30 a.m. The Committee reconvened at 1.37 p.m.

6. Planning Application: Waste

WSCC/050/18/BK Erection of replacement dwelling, including acoustic bunds along east, west and side boundaries. Dan Tree Farm, London Road, Bolney, West Sussex, RH17 5QD.

6.1 The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes). The report was introduced by James Neave, Principal Planner, who gave a presentation on the proposals, details of the consultation and key issues in respect of the application.

6.2 Mr Alan Potter, specialist on waste planning policy on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Mr Potter declared that he recently worked with the County Council on annual reports on construction waste management capacity and the formulation of the current WLP. The application is compliant with at least five out of nine criteria of Policy W8 of the WLP: it provides clear benefits; involves only material that cannot be recycled or treated and is suitable for the purpose; does not involve unacceptable impacts on natural resources or other environmental constraints, and does not sterilise mineral reserves. The criterion requiring a genuine need to use waste material is about proposals not being advanced solely on the basis of providing outlets for waste; it should not be construed as a 'need'. The bund is not a waste development, it is only being heard as such because of the County Council's insistence that it is. The bund may be constructed of material that is not defined as waste. Regarding criteria for amount of material, the design will minimise the amount used whilst achieving performance in noise mitigation. The applicant was given no opportunity to demonstrate an identified need for disposal of inert waste. The County Council itself predicts an exhaustion of recovery capacity in 2019-20, so the assertion that material could be otherwise managed through recovery is not supported by facts. The application will help meet local needs.

6.3 Mr Peter Radmall, author of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), spoke in support of the application. Design of the bunds must strike a balance between acoustic mitigation, the natural terrain, ease of construction and proportion of the residential land used. Local topography is already extensively modified, mainly due to the A23 and there is acoustic bunding immediately to the south so engineered landforms are already characteristic in the area and the bund would not be incongruous. Earthworks on the A23 have become densely vegetated and are readily assimilated into the landscape; vegetation on the proposed bund will soften the effect. The current site contributes little to the character of the area. The development will not affect the vegetated boundaries which already screen the site. Development will be most visible during construction. A planting scheme will be agreed. Regarding the AONB Management Plan, the site has no bearing on settlements or routeways, supports neither woodland nor heathland and is not part of any historic field pattern, so does not impact on the character of the High Weald. In terms of natural topography, the bunds may not replicate the natural undulating ridge-line but it remains intact beneath. The development is of modest scale in relation to the size of the AONB, which local exhibits few of its special qualities in this locality.

6.4 Mr Simon Bareham, Director at Lewis and Co Planning, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. Noise from the A23 means neither the house nor garden will achieve satisfactory noise levels in accordance with World Health Organisation guidance. Sealed windows and mechanical ventilation will not achieve noise reduction when using the garden; also, mechanical ventilation would increase energy use. Acoustic bunds would provide a satisfactory residential environment. The bunds do not need to be constructed out of inert waste but it would make more sense to use waste that would otherwise be diverted elsewhere. Bunds would be a visibly superior to acoustic fencing. The Environmental Health Officer recommends approval of the application. Proposals are supported

by numerous reports. The recommendation is inconsistent in that the neighbouring site to the south [Bolney Park Farm] has an acoustic bund. The proposed bund is on residential land, is shorter, lower and less than half as wide as the bund to the south and it uses less than half the material, and it would result in a 6dB reduction in noise in the garden. The bund at Bolney Park Farm is on agricultural land and produces a 9dB reduction. The justification for the bund in both applications is to improve acoustic quality.

6.5 Mrs Joy Dennis, local member for Hurstpierpoint and Bolney spoke on the application. The site is higher than the A23, lined with woods and shrubs on the boundary including an Ancient Woodland to the north. The neighbouring site to the south [Bolney Park Farm] is lower and its existing bund forms part of the landscape. However, there are other equestrian centres in the area which don't have bunds and get more noise. To approve this application would be setting a precedent for other properties on main roads. Bunds are not attractive in the context of the landscape and ancient woodland and it would take a long time for planting to establish. The waste from existing building on the site would form only a small part of the 45,000 tonnes to be imported. It was questioned when a minimal change becomes an overwhelming change.

6.6 In response to speakers, Planning Officers made the following points for the purposes of clarification – further points regarding the bund at Bolney Park Farm are noted in minute 6.7, below:

- The existing planning permission for a dwelling was approved without bunds, indicating the noise environment is acceptable.
- Approved plans of the bund to the south at Bolney Park Farm were shown to the Committee in order to provide context: the slopes are much less steep, bunds are wider, and they follow the linear features of the landscape, including the A23. The current application has much steeper sides, bunds are narrower and on one level. Each development must be considered on its own merits.

6.7 During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Planning Officers, where applicable:

Bunds at Bolney Park Farm

Point raised – Clarification was sought regarding the planning policy regime under which bunds at Bolney Park Farm were approved.

Response – The bunds at Bolney Park Farm were approved in 2012 prior to adoption of the current WLP and the policy relating to the deposit of inert waste to land.

Need

Points raised – The fact that the existing planning permission for a dwelling was approved without bunds negates the need to mitigate noise in the interests of residential amenity. This is clearly disposal of waste because the site is not previously worked.

Response – None required.

Impacts on AONB

Points raised – This application is major development and in terms of the AONB it does not meet the exceptional circumstance test. As to whether the development has a significant impact, because vegetation is not always permanent the bunds will be a prominent feature in the landscape when vegetation is sparse.

Response – None required.

6.8. The substantive recommendation, subject to reasons for refusal as set out in Appendix 1, was proposed by Mr Patel and seconded by Lt. Cdr. Atkins and was put to the Committee and refused by a majority.

6.9 Resolved – That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Appendix 1 of the report, as agreed by the Committee.

7. Development Management Performance (1 April 2018 - 31 March 2019)

7.1 The committee received and noted a report by the Head of Planning Services on development management performance (1 April 2017 – 31 March 2018). The report was introduced by Jane Moseley, County Planning Team Manager, who provided a presentation on the work undertaken by the County Planning Team in relation to the determination of planning applications over the past year.

7.2. During the discussion of the item the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the County Planning Manager, where applicable:

Extensions of time to determine applications

Point raised – How much is the team relying on extensions of time to meet targets?

Response – This information is not included in the report due to a cross over to a new planning system. However, extensions of time are an accepted mechanism for managing planning applications.

Quality of major developments

Point raised – The figures of 10% of 100% in the section Quality of Major Development in Table 1 of the Committee report was queried.

Response – The County Planning Manager will check the accuracy, but confirmed that the Planning Team is doing well in terms of Quality of Major Development.

7.3 The Committee thanked the Planning Team for its work.

8. Update on Mineral, Waste and Regulation 3 Planning Applications

8.1 The Committee received and noted a report by the Head of Planning Services on applications awaiting determination (copy appended to the signed minutes) detailing the schedule of County Matter applications and the schedule of applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 – Regulation 3.

9. Report of Delegated Action

9.1 The Committee received and noted a report by the Head of Planning Services (copy appended to the signed minutes) applications approved subject to conditions under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 since the Planning Committee meeting on 26 March 2019.

10. Date of Next Meeting

10.1 The following scheduled meeting of Planning Committee will be on Tuesday, 10 September 2019 at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Chichester.

The meeting ended at 2.21 pm

Chairman