

## **Planning and Rights of Way Committee**

27 June 2023 – At a meeting of the Planning and Rights of Way Committee held at 10.30 am at County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RQ.

Present: Cllr Burrett (Chairman)

Cllr Atkins, Cllr Duncton, Cllr Gibson, Cllr McDonald, Cllr Oakley, Cllr Patel and Cllr Quinn

Apologies were received from Cllr Ali, Cllr Kerry-Bedell, Cllr Montyn and Cllr Wild

---

### **Part I**

#### **7. Declarations of Interest**

7.1 In accordance with the County Council's Code of Conduct, Cllr Jay Mercer (as part of his written statement read out to the Committee) declared a Personal Interest in Item 5 – Planning Application WSCC/047/21 - because he has recently become the Cabinet Member for Environmental Health, Recycling and Waste at Horsham District Council, but stated that he has had no involvement in this planning application.

#### **8. Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee**

8.1 The Committee noted that at the time of the publication of the agenda for this meeting the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee dated 6 June 2023 were in preparation. The minutes are now available as draft minutes on the Planning and Rights of Way Committee pages of the County Council's website and they will be submitted for confirmation to the next meeting of the Committee.

#### **9. Urgent Matters**

9.1 There were no urgent matters.

#### **10. Planning Application: Regulation 3**

**WSCC/047/21 - Creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, floodlighting, macadam hardstanding area, storage container, timber acoustic barrier fence and macadam access pathway. The Forest School, Compton's Lane, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5NT.**

10.1 The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services, as amended by the Agenda Update Sheet. The report was introduced by Edward Anderson, Planner, who outlined the application and the key points. The Committee was advised that the following should also be noted, which do not change the substantive recommendation:

- The response from WSCC Archaeology, as detailed in the Agenda Update Sheet, from which is proposed an additional Condition - 'Written Scheme of Investigation'.
- A slight error in paragraph 8.1 of the Committee report. It should be noted that third party representation numbers should read 115 representations, of which there were 70 objections, 28 in support and 17 that provided comments.

10.2 NOTE: the following representations to the Committee made reference either to an All-Weather Pitch (AWP) and/or Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) and/or Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA). Such expressions, should, in general, apply to the whole proposed facility and could be viewed as interchangeable in most of the references.

10.3 Mr Dennis Manning, a local resident who has a son as a pupil at The Forest School, spoke in objection to the application. An AWP might be seen as an asset and a benefit to pupils. The proposed construction materials may pose a health concern and further studies should be considered before a decision is made. Residents would expect after school hours and weekends to be quiet, apart from the occasional school club. The Committee report clearly states that this development, in the school grounds on the eastern side of Compton's Lane, is in a "predominantly residential area" and refers to "properties along the northern side of St Leonard's Road to the south, which are located between 15m and 95m from the application site". Noise reduction plans will not stop noise reaching these residents. The World Health Organisation 'Guidelines for Community Noise' were written 24 years ago. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act provides for respect for "an individual's private life and home" and Article 1 of Protocol 1 provides that "an individual's peaceful enjoyment of their property shall not be interfered with save as is necessary in the public interest". This proposal will mean unacceptable disturbance and inconvenience at all hours, and residents will only be free from disruption after 21.00 hours in the evening. Should the residents pay the sacrifice for the football for the Horsham area being a "public interest"? There are adequate 3G AGP facilities elsewhere in Horsham, at Horsham Rugby Club and Tithe Barn. The provision for a complaints process compounds the point that complaints will be expected. There is no issue with a facility for pupils within school hours or an hour afterwards.

10.4 Mr Keith Hemsley, local resident, spoke in objection to the application. Objections are on the basis of location, hours of use and need. Of the four possible options, the chosen option is the one that would have the most impact on local residents, being sited very close to the perimeter fence. The acoustic report omitted the closest residential property from the plan and was only computer modelled. Due to the slope of the site the proposed AGP will be levelled, making it 5 metres above the patio of the closest houses on St Leonard's Road, which are 5-6 ft below the current level of the school field. The floodlights will be 17 metres high when viewed from the gardens. There would be considerable light pollution. The suggested "average" noise is disputed. There will be loud shouting, foul language and ball strikes reverberating again the fence. It is not understood why there is a need for intense use of the MUGA, as per the proposed hours of use, other than a financial one. Little consideration

has been given to residents' privacy and enjoyment of their gardens, which they should have the right to, especially in the evenings and at weekends. It is suggested that an AWP is a much needed amenity, but there are others in Horsham and more are planned. None are sited in the middle of residential areas. If the AWP was for the use of pupils only it would be supported, but it will impact the daily lives and mental well-being of the residents, who will not have any respite from disruption.

10.5 The Clerk to the Committee read out a statement in objection to the application on behalf of Mrs Angela Cornford, local resident. AGPs are not for multi-use, being only suitable for football and possibly rugby. Contrary to the Officer's Report, there is no regular use on weekday evenings. This is impossible in the winter months when I can get dark at 4pm. The financial benefits are questioned, especially with maintenance costs. Replacement would be required after an average 8-10 year lifespan, which also means it is not sustainable development. Would the proposal be economically viable and is there sufficient high demand for community use? The Southern Water Pre-capacity Check, dated 3 August 2021, was only valid for 12 months and has expired. The need for watering, as part of the Landscape Maintenance Plan, surely goes against water neutrality. The detrimental effect on the lives of local residents is a very serious matter. Articles about the concerns about the health risks caused by synthetic 3G AGPs and the use of toxic rubber crumb microplastics (ground-up end of life tyres), as well as the environmental impacts, were referenced. The European Commission in 2022 stated it is considering a ban on intentionally added microplastics. Michael Gove wants to ban all new housing developments from installing artificial grass. It has a devastating effect on ecology. Sport England is still promoting this proposal because there is no UK legislation and a lack of alternative suitable infill material. Could the Section 106 Agreement funding be better spent, e.g. on solar panels for school buildings or classroom provision?

10.6 Mr Ian Straw, Headteacher, The Forest School, Horsham, spoke in support of the application. In 2020 an agreement was made to give up some land for provision of outdoor space to the QEII School in exchange for an AWP. The Forest School is the only secondary school in Horsham not to have such a facility. Changes to the school have included the admission of girls. The school currently has full-sized rugby and football pitches, a cricket pitch, a 9-a-side sized football pitch, running track and long-jump sandpit, but there is a requirement to provide suitable co-educational sports facilities, including to add hockey to the curriculum. The existing pitches currently enjoy unlimited hours of use and, prior to Covid-19 and this application being made, they were regularly let out including in the evenings. However, the pitches are usually unusable from October to May due to the weather. This impacts on break and lunch-time space and also means the Hall has to be used for sports which then impacts on its use for Drama lessons. The MUGA would give year-round provision. It would be used for after school clubs until 4.30 pm and made available for hire from 5pm. 38 expressions of interest - many from youth-based clubs - have been made regarding hire of the facility and the proposed hours of use would give flexibility for bookings. The maintenance and budget will be taken seriously and it is

aimed for the facility to be self-sufficient. The Forest School wishes to be a responsible neighbour as well as providing a local facility.

10.7 Mr Dan Edwards, Manager of Roffey Robins Football Club, a football coach and parent of a pupil at The Forest School, spoke in support of the application. Roffey Robins has expanded since being founded and now needs to cater to 21 teams, requiring facilities to train during weekday winter evenings and for matchdays on weekend mornings. There is a lack of AWP in Horsham for the number of clubs in existence in the immediate area, each with multiple teams. This would require nine plus AWP facilities, when currently there are only two. Grassroots teams are fighting a losing battle to provide adequate facilities for youth players. The proposed facility would be nothing but positive for the school, meaning that no PE lessons would have to move indoors because of pitch conditions. No after school matches would have to be cancelled. Last season the weather was extremely wet and there was almost 3 months where teams were unable to play matches and games were cancelled. As well as missed games, children missed out on the benefits of playing team sports, which can lead to negative impacts, especially for some vulnerable children. Player safety and development would be improved through the use of AGPs.

10.8 A statement on behalf of Cllr Jay Mercer, local County Councillor for Horsham East, was read out by the Chairman. Many residents, who are parents or grandparents of pupils or past pupils at the school, have objected or raised concerns, although all recognise that the MUGA would be good for the school and students. Mitigating amendments should have been better and clearly communicated. The need for the position of the pitch has been explained, including the strategic pressure for school places and access for children with special educational needs or disabilities. Water neutrality mitigation has been explained. Concerns have been raised about potential environmental impacts of Grade 3 AWP and the dispersal of in-fill material; Sport England has proposed mitigation measures including kickboards and brush-off-zones. Clarity is required about the size of the pitch; residents had been told it would be 90% of competition size but it is described as a "full-sized outside sporting facility". Residents' concerns about use by adult teams, resulting in additional traffic and crowd noise, has not been addressed in the Committee report. There is a difference in the hours of use requested by Horsham District Council's Environmental Health Officer, who would "maintain objection" if hours are not reduced to mitigate light and noise, and Sport England, who see reduction as restricting health, well-being and economic benefits. A Noise Management Plan will be critical for factors relating to noise monitoring, which the school has stated it will implement. Similarly for light. It is critical that the school should implement all mitigation actions if the application is approved.

10.9 In response to speakers' comments, the Planning Officer clarified the following:

- The terms AGP and MUGA; AGP refers to the grass pitch and MUGA refers to the whole facility including perimeter structures and lighting.

- The Noise Impact Assessment was updated during the process of the application and does include the closest residential property.

10.10 During the debate the Committee raised the points below and responses or clarification was provided by the Planning Officers, as follows:

### **Location of the proposed MUGA within the sports field**

**Points raised** – What is the rationale for the location of the proposed MUGA within the sports field? Four options were mentioned, were these in different locations? The proposed MUGA is well thought out and makes good use of the land, including retaining the trees.

**Response** – The proposed location of the MUGA was deemed by the applicant to be the most appropriate in terms of maximum sporting provision, allowing for the retention of existing sports facilities including the running track and also the retention of trees.

### **Size of the proposed football pitch**

**Point raised** – Clarification was sought regarding the point made by Cllr Mercer about whether the size of the proposed pitch is 90% or a full-sized football pitch.

**Response** – The proposed MUGA would accommodate an 11-a-side football pitch, so would be a full-sized football pitch.

### **Enforcement of letting**

**Point raised** – How would the letting of the pitch and conditions that restrict hours of use be enforced?

**Response** – Control of use would be secured by agreements for the rental of the MUGA, including a time-schedule (Community Use Agreement as per recommended condition). It would also be subject to the Conditions 'Hours of Use' and 'Hours of Operation – Floodlights'. It should also be noted that the existing school field can be rented out.

### **Benefits to health, wellbeing and sporting achievement**

**Points raised** – The benefits of sports, in terms of combatting obesity and mental health, were noted. The provision of the MUGA would provide more teams and people with the ability to train for longer and more regular periods.

**Response** – None required.

### **Need for the development**

**Points raised** – There is a need for AWP's, including for weekend use. The proposal would benefit the local community. It would

keep facilities available for hire on one site. Horsham District Council's Sport Open Space and Recreation Study (2014) has referenced the requirement for at least five new playing pitches; are all of these subject to Community Use Agreements? Since that report, female participation in field team sports has increased and studies about the need for such facilities have not kept up with this.

**Response** – Policy 43 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that the provision of community facilities or services would be supported, particularly where they meet the identified needs of local communities, as indicated in the current Sport Open Space and Recreation Study. The provision of the pitches mentioned in the study would be subject to Community Use Agreements, especially where they relate to a school site. Such sites are supported by Sport England where they provide maximum community engagement, alongside the deliverance of sporting benefits.

### **Impact on residential amenity**

**Points raised** – It should be noted that there are four AWP's in Crawley, all of which are in residential locations. The Committee must consider the balance between intensification of use and the impact on residents, which is something that has become a common theme with other similar planning applications.

**Response** – None required.

### **Impact on highway capacity and road safety**

**Points raised** – It was noted that there have been no objections from WSCC Highways with regards to parking, although WSCC Highways acknowledged there would be an increase in vehicle movements.

**Response** – None required regarding parking. The increase in vehicle movements was stated by WSCC Highways to be not unacceptable.

### **Height of the bund**

**Point raised** – Clarification was sought regarding the height of the proposed bund.

**Response** – The bund would be 3m in height from the existing ground level. It should be noted that the bund varies in height along its top surface. Trees and shrubs would be planted and would, in time, somewhat disguise the top of the bund.

### **Landscaping**

**Points raised** – It was suggested that planting should replace the proposed fence. The retention of the existing trees was noted.

**Response** – Some trees and shrubs will be planted, as noted in paragraph 9.16 of the Committee report. This would be controlled by the Condition 'Landscape Maintenance Plan', as noted in Appendix 1.

### **Economic viability**

**Point raised** – Clarification was sought as to whether the economic viability of the proposed site is a material consideration.

**Response** – The economics of the way the site would be managed are not material to the consideration of the application. The Committee has to decide whether the proposal is an appropriate use of the land. However, a broader point is that a crucial issue has been that one of Sport England's key drivers is that the site should be made widely available for community use.

### **Water neutrality**

**Points raised** – Water savings ought to be good practice. It was queried whether water neutrality considerations include water consumption during the construction phase? Was simultaneous use of both the MUGA and the cricket pitch included in the calculations in the water use report, as mitigations appear to only be based on use of the MUGA; this is a point of principle and should be borne in mind for other planning applications.

**Response** – It is for WSCC as landowner to ensure water efficiency in its buildings, albeit officers are aware that this is being reviewed in light of water resource issues. Water use during construction is not considered as part of proposed water demand. This is a consistent approach with other affected local authorities and has been accepted by Natural England. A cricket pitch is already in existence and the proposal is to move the wicket further to the west. There is not, therefore, any increase in water usage arising from the relocation of the cricket pitch. The worst case maximum water usage of the proposed MUGA has been taken into account. Offsetting measures include changes inside the school, e.g. reduced flow taps. The robustness of the water neutrality assessment has been verified by Natural England and an independent consultant.

### **Land drainage**

**Points raised** – Will the proposed development affect existing land drainage flow routes, noting the current issues with waterlogging? Is this capacity based on the future forecast rainfall events, including 1 in 100 year rainfall events plus 40%? And is the 2 litres per second discharge, mentioned in the Drainage Plan, in addition to the 5 litres per second capacity as stated by Southern Water? Can the Committee be confident that there would not be flooding off-site due to overloading of the surface water drain on the southern edge of the site?

**Response** – The Condition 'Drainage Verification Report' would require the applicant to submit this prior to first use and it would need to ensure the site drains to agreed greenfield rates. The School would have to agree to Southern Water requirements prior to commencement of the development. A 2 litre per second discharge from the proposed site is anticipated and the surface water drain on the southern edge of the site has a 5 litre per second capacity. No drainage concerns in relation to this were raised throughout the consultation process.

### **Plan of the location of the cricket pitch**

**Points raised** – It was noted that the Condition 'Approved Plans' does not include the proposed Site Plan which is the only one that includes the relocation of the cricket pitch, and it was suggested that Plan number 'S52890-03 Rev 07' be included. There is also a discrepancy between the location of the cricket pitch on that plan and the location on the Landscape General Arrangement Plan.

**Response** – The cricket wicket forms part of the application description. Should the Committee feel it appropriate to include Plan number 'S52890-03 Rev 07' then this could be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to include in the Condition 'Approved Plans'.

### **The cricket pitch, netting and simultaneous use with the MUGA**

**Points raised** – How high would the ball-stop net to the east side of the cricket pitch need to be to allow for simultaneous use with the MUGA? Would the net be a permanent fixture? What would be the impact on the landscape?

**Response** – The net would be 14 metres high, directly between the cricket pitch and the MUGA to allow for simultaneous use. This application does not include the installation of a ball-stop net and so that cannot be considered to be part of the application. That would require a separate planning application. However, the Condition requires that at no time shall the MUGA be used concurrently with the cricket NTP until the ball strike protection netting to protect users of the AGP has been first installed, in accordance with any relevant planning permission. Without this both facilities cannot be used concurrently.

### **Condition 'Pitch Management and Maintenance Scheme'**

**Point raised** – The proposed Condition 'Pitch Management and Maintenance Scheme' refers to a MUGA; Sport England has referred to the proposal as an AGP, so this should be clarified.

**Response** – As noted in Bullet Point 1 of Minute 10.9 above, AGP refers to the grass pitch and MUGA refers to the whole facility including perimeter structures and lighting. Should the Committee



feel it is required to amend the Condition 'Pitch Management and Maintenance Scheme' then this could be delegated to the Head of Planning Services to undertake.

### **Planting** (see also Minutes 10.12 to 10.15)

**Points raised** – In reference to the Condition 'Landscape Maintenance Plan', it was suggested that replacement planting, required by condition, should be in perpetuity because other local authorities are moving towards this. As an alternative to this, 10 years should be considered for replacement planting instead of the standard 5 years.

**Response** – The substantive point would be the replacement of a five year replanting scheme with either one that is in perpetuity or for 10 years; the latter of which has been approved in some other planning applications. Planning Officers would need to check whether the proposal for planting replacement in perpetuity, in order to provide a biodiversity gain, would meet the legal tests and whether it would be reasonable to require this. The Committee could consider a motion to amend the Condition if a proposal to do so is made. Irrespective of the outcome, Planning Officers agreed to investigate the point and consider it for future applications, if relevant.

### **Lifespan of the AGP**

**Points raised** – Where does the information about the average lifespan of 8-10 years of an AGP originate from? It is understood that a similar facility in Worthing has an expected lifespan of 20-25 years.

**Response** – There is no definitive answer but it is understood that the lifespan of AGPs is typically 8-10 years. There is a relationship between use and management and maintenance of a facility, so a key consideration would be the ongoing maintenance of the AGP to a professional condition as required by professional sporting bodies.

### **Hours of use**

**Point raised** – Clarification was sought regarding inconsistency around hours of use across different sites in the county.

**Response** – Hours of use for such facilities are fairly standard across the county. Variations are due to individual circumstances. The proposed hours of use for the MUGA were influenced by Sport England's requirement for it to be available for community use.

### **Infill material**

**Points raised** – It was noted that different AWP's use different materials and that there is wide community concern around the proposal for use of the rubber crumb infill material. It is understood

that Mid Sussex District Council is researching alternative materials for AWP's.

**Response** – Officers consulted Sport England regarding the proposed infill material. The MUGA would be built to specifications required by different UK sporting bodies, whose view – and that of the UK Government - is that this is something they are keeping an eye on and looking for alternatives to.

10.11 The Committee delegated the following to the Head of Planning Services:

- To make any minor amendments to the Conditions in terms of any grammatical errors and to remove Informative D.
- To check whether it is necessary to change reference in the Condition 'Pitch Management and Maintenance Scheme' to AGP from use of the term MUGA, and make any such amendments that are deemed necessary.
- To include, as per the Agenda Update Sheet, a Condition 'Written Scheme of Investigation' in the appropriate position within the Conditions and Informatives, and, as a result, to renumber any Conditions, as appropriate.
- To include, if required, under Condition 'Approved Plans' Plan number 'S52890-03 Rev 07' within the list, which shows the proposed location of the cricket pitch and wicket.

10.12 Cllr Oakley proposed the following amendment:

#### **Landscape Maintenance Plan**

Prior to the commencement of the development, an updated Landscape Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The plan should include details in relation to the watering, mulching and weeding schedule of the proposed landscaping. Any seeding which fails, plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within the first five years shall be replaced in the next planting season in accordance with the approved details **as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number, as was originally approved, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority.** Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout.

*Reason: To ensure the proposed landscaping is maintained in the interest of the environment and residential amenity **To maintain, in perpetuity, the necessary landscape screening of the MUGA and also to ensure biodiversity net gain improvements for the longer term.***

10.13 No Committee Member seconded the proposal. Therefore, the motion fell.

10.14 Cllr Oakley proposed the following amendment:

## **Landscape Maintenance Plan**

Prior to the commencement of the development, an updated Landscape Maintenance Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority. The plan should include details in relation to the watering, mulching and weeding schedule of the proposed landscaping. Any seeding which fails, plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within the first five **ten** years shall be replaced in the next planting season in accordance with the approved details. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout.

*Reason: To ensure the proposed landscaping is maintained in the interest of the environment and residential amenity.*

10.15 The proposal was seconded by Cllr Gibson. The proposal was voted on by the Committee with two in favour and two against and four abstentions. This left a casting vote to the Chairman, who gave the casting vote against the proposal on the basis that, given the numbers, the case had not been made. Therefore, the motion fell.

10.16 The substantive recommendation, including changes to Conditions and Informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of the Committee report, as amended by the Agenda Update Sheet and also including amendments delegated to the Head of Planning Services, as approved by the Committee, was proposed by Cllr Duncton and seconded by Cllr Patel, and voted on by the Committee and approved unanimously.

10.17 Resolved:-

That planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of the report and amended by the Agenda Update Sheet and also amended, as agreed, by the Committee.

10.18 The Committee recessed at 12.20 pm and reconvened at 12.28 pm. During the recess Cllr Duncton left the meeting.

## **11. Development Management Annual Report 2022**

11.1 The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services. The report was introduced by James Neave, Principal Planning Officer, who clarified that:

- The report is for the 2022 calendar year.
- Since the publication of the report, a decision notice has been issued by the Planning Inspectorate regarding the appeal on Application number WSCC/081/19, Proposed Temporary Concrete Crushing and Soil Recycling Facility, Kilmarnock Farm, Charlwood Road, Ifield, RH11 0JY. The Planning Inspector upheld, on all grounds, the decision of the Council, which was to refuse the application. The Planning Inspector's dismissal also

included additional matters relating to water neutrality and flooding; it is acknowledged that these did come in after the decision that was made by this Committee.

11.2 The Committee raised the points below and responses or clarification was provided by the Planning Officers, as noted below.

### **Hydrocarbons planning applications**

**Points raised** – What additional procedures have been adopted to address the determination of hydrocarbon applications in required timeframes? It was noted that records are over two years, so determination percentages will change quickly given the limited number of hydrocarbons applications.

**Response** – Planning Officers now conduct a regular review of determination dates during weekly team meetings, including a traffic light reporting system. The team's Technicians also now review determination dates to ensure extensions in time are being picked up and recorded properly. It was agreed that performance figures can change very quickly given the limited number of hydrocarbon application dealt with, and that this is moving in the right direction.

### **Statutory Consultees**

**Points raised** – Have there been any significant issues with timeframes for responses from statutory consultees? How often do we chase operators for compliance with operational conditions?

**Response** – Yes some are indeed delayed, albeit response times for statutory consultees vary. Resource problems are sometimes cited as the reason for delays. Where there are issues regarding the timeliness of responses, Planning Officers chase repeatedly for outstanding responses. Enforcement of conditions tends to be reactive. Visits to key waste sites are more frequent and often include spot visits and checks when officers are in the locality.

### **Follow-on actions and Discharge of Conditions**

**Point raised** – The Committee was pleased with Discharge of Condition and Non-material Amendment applications now appearing as individual applications and on the online system. Do Town and Parish Councils get informed of Discharge of Condition applications?

**Response** – There is no statutory requirement to consult on Discharge of Condition applications, and this generally does not take place with Town and Parish Councils. There is however discretion for officers to consult any other parties should there be specific justification or reasoning for doing so, which is decided on a case-by-case basis. In general terms, technical consultees will be contacted (e.g. Highways/EHOs/Environment Agency) particularly where they have specifically requested a condition.

11.3 Resolved:

The Committee noted the report.

## **12. Date of Next Meeting**

12.1 The next scheduled meeting of the Planning and Rights of Way Committee will be on Tuesday, 18 July 2023 at 10.30 am.

12.2 Members noted items likely to be considered at the next meeting of the Planning and Rights of Way Committee on Tuesday, 18 July would include DMMO 3/19 - Addition of a BW along the full length of Sheepwash Lane, West Wittering – G18. In addition, the following planning applications would be scheduled to be considered by the Committee in due course: WSCC/028/21 - The continued winning, working and processing of sand from the existing Rock Common Quarry, the importation of inert classified engineering and restoration material, the stockpiling and treating of the imported material, the placement of the imported material within the quarry void and the restoration and landscaping of the quarry, Rock Common Quarry, The Hollow, Washington, Pulborough, RH20 3DA, and also WSCC/021/23 - Regularisation, consolidation and extension to the existing waste transfer facility including an increase in throughput of waste, Recycle Southern Ltd, Elbridge Farm, Chichester Road, Bognor Regis, PO21 5EF. The scheduling of items to be considered by the Planning and Rights of Way Committee is subject to change.

The meeting ended at 12.43 pm

Chairman