13. **D/08/01832/DOM**

**Proposal**  
'Single storey side and rear extension and porch.

**Site**  
28 Selsey Road Donnington Chichester West Sussex PO19 8SN

**Map Ref**  
(E) 485396 (N) 103209

**Applicant**  
Mr Farhart Massoumian
History

07/01995/DOM REF Proposed loft alteration with dormers to side and rear of the property.
07/02920/DOM PER Proposed loft alteration with dormers to side and rear of the property.
08/01832/DOM PDE Single storey side and rear extension and porch.

Constraints

Listed Building NO
Conservation Area NO
Rural Area NO
AONB NO
Strategic Gap NO
Tree Preservation Order NO
Proposed South Downs NO
National Park
Flood Zone 2 NO

Historic Parks and Gardens NO

1.0 Reason for Committee Referral

Parish Objection - Officer recommends Permit

2.0 Representations and Consultations

2.1 Parish Council

Object to proposal.

Overdevelopment of site.

If proposal allowed, the Parish Council would expect tree removal to be replaced elsewhere on the site by at least two other native species.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 Relevant policies in the Chichester District Local Plan include BE11 (new development) and BE12 (alterations, extensions and conversions).

3.2 The aims of the Chichester Community Strategy documents are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, however, the document has not been examined in public and therefore only very limited weight can be given to its aims. The following aims are considered relevant to this application, they are as follows:

A.1 - Housing - Ensure the provision of housing to meet a range of local needs through a mix of housing types, sizes, and tenures.

A.2 - Housing - Help people to meet their own housing needs through information, support and advice.
A.4 - Housing - Create sustainable and diverse communities where good design makes attractive communities for people to choose to live and work.

A.6 - Housing - Improve the quality of the housing stock and home energy efficiency.

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

3.3 The following government guidance in respect of this application is to be found in the following document PPS1.

4.0 **Planning Comments**

4.1 28 Selsey Road is a two storey semi-detached house situated near the southern edge of the Donnington Settlement Policy Area adjoining open country.

4.2 The proposal is to extend the rear of the house at ground floor level to form a kitchen, together with a further addition at the side of the house to form a utility room and a shower room. In addition, a small porch is proposed to enclose the front door.

4.3 The main issues are whether the size of the extension is in scale with the house, whether there would be harm to adjoining living conditions, and whether the street scene and general character of the area would be adversely affected.

4.4 The footprint of the existing house is about 53.7sqm and that of the proposed extension is about 25.6sqm, about 48% of the total. There would be a gap of 3.2m between the southern end of the extension and the boundary with 30 Selsey Road. The latter has a substantial single storey extension to its rear. Your officers do not consider that the proposed extension is out of scale with the main house, being designed with wall and roof materials to match those existing.

4.5 The rear wall of the extension would project 3m beyond the house and would have some impact on the enjoyment of no. 26 Selsey Road. However, the angle of view from the nearest habitable room window would not be obstructed, and the proposal therefore complies with the Council's guidelines. The part of the extension that follows the side of the house would also have some effect on no. 26, but that property has a door and two windows (all fitted with obscured glass) on its side elevation, so no significant harm would result.

4.6 In terms of any impact on the street scene, the front porch would integrate well with the existing bay window in height and detailing. The only part of the extension that would be visible from the road is the addition to the side of the house. The width of this part is only 1.6m and would be set back from a projecting wing comprising a study.

4.7 In respect of the rights of the applicants and the occupiers of neighbouring properties to peaceful enjoyment of their homes, it is considered that the recommendation to permit subject to the conditions specified is justified and proportionate for the reasons given above.

4.8 Conditions are recommended to require replacement tree planting.
**RECOMMENDATION**  
**PERMIT**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A01F</td>
<td>Time Limit - Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F02F</td>
<td>Materials to Match Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U33689</td>
<td>No more windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U34097</td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>U34098</td>
<td>Tree-planting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMATIVES**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>U33690</td>
<td>Informative: Reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U33693</td>
<td>Informative: Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information on this application please contact Richard Dixon on 01243 534734
14. **EWB/08/01469/DOM**

**Proposal**  
Raise existing roof to provide first floor accommodation. Provide pitched roof to front of garage.

**Site**  
Sea Esta East Bracklesham Drive Bracklesham Chichester West Sussex PO20 8JH

**Map Ref**  
(E) 480627 (N) 96322

**Applicant**  
Mr Allan Day
History

08/01469/DOM  PDE  Raise existing roof to provide first floor accommodation. Provide pitched roof to front of garage.

Constraints

Listed Building  NO
Conservation Area  NO
Rural Area  NO
AONB  NO
Strategic Gap  NO
Tree Preservation Order  NO
Proposed South Downs  NO
National Park  NO
Flood Zone 2  NO

Historic Parks and Gardens  NO

1.0 Reason for Committee Referral

Parish Objection - Officer recommends Permit

2.0 Representations and Consultations

2.1 Parish Council

Object to proposal.

This is obtrusive overdevelopment and appears to be incongruous with the street scene. The Parish Council feel this application would benefit from inclusion of a street scene view together with existing layout and elevations in relation to the adjacent properties.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 Relevant policies in the Chichester District Local Plan are BE11 (New development), BE12 (Alterations, extensions and conversions) and BE13 (Town cramming).

3.2 The aims of the Chichester Community Strategy documents are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, however, the document has not been examined in public and therefore only very limited weight can be given to its aims. The following aims are considered relevant to this application, they are as follows:

A.1 - Housing - Ensure the provision of housing to meet a range of local needs through a mix of housing types, sizes, and tenures.

A.2 - Housing - Help people to meet their own housing needs through information, support and advice.

A.4 - Housing - Create sustainable and diverse communities where good design makes attractive communities for people to choose to live and work.
A.6 - Housing - Improve the quality of the housing stock and home energy efficiency.

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

3.3 The following government guidance in respect of this application is to be found in the following documents PPS1 and PPS3.

**4.0 Planning Comments**

4.1 Sea Esta is a bungalow situated amongst other dwellings of similar size and height on the north side of East Bracklesham Drive. The proposal is to increase the height of the side walls and construct a new pitched roof, with the aim of using the increased roof space as habitable accommodation comprising (ground floor), three bedrooms (two with en-suite bathrooms), a separate bathroom and utility room and (first floor) lounge, kitchen/diner and a bedroom.

4.2 The main issues are whether the proposed development would be harmful to the character of the area, and whether the living conditions of adjoining occupiers would be adversely affected.

4.3 The present bungalow is set with its ridge at a right angle to the road. There is a flat-roofed single storey extension to its rear, and the height of the main ridge above ground level, is 4.8m. Adjoining bungalows are of a similar height. It is proposed to raise the existing side walls from their present eaves level of 2.5m to 4.2m above ground level. The proposed ridge height would be 6.5m, an increase of 1.7m.

4.4 The aim is to provide accommodation at first floor level without altering the bungalow to a full two-storey house. This would be achieved by setting the first floor eaves level below the top of the first floor window-heads. (A full two-storey house using the same roof pitch of 35 degrees as existing would result in a ridge height of 7.2m.)

4.5 Given the variety of house-styles and roof-heights in East Bracklesham Drive, your officers do not consider that the increase in height and mass would be harmful to the character of the general street scene.

4.6 The other main issue is the likely impact on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. There is no doubt that the additional height and bulk that would have an effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the two bungalows adjoining and the dwelling near the rear boundary of the site. The proposal has been assessed against the Council's Planning Guidance Note 3 on household extensions, and in terms of angles of view from adjoining windows, the proposed extension would not contravene these standards.

4.7 However, the distance between a proposed bedroom window in the increased first floor section at the rear of the bungalow would be 9.5m from the side wall of 2 Old Farm Close. The minimum standard is normally 12m, but the proposed rear elevation of the dwelling would directly overlook the front garden of no. 2, a semi-public area, being part of the communal parking and turning area in Old Farm Close. The rear garden of no. 2 is a well-screened private area and would also be affected but at an oblique angle. These relationships are considered satisfactory.

4.8 The relatively low first floor eaves of the extended dwelling has resulted in the two side-facing windows in the west elevation being unusually set only 0.5m above floor level. At this height these are considered unneighbourly to the adjoining property Shay-Wen. The applicant has been asked to
delete these windows and replace them with rooflights which, because of their height above floor level, would not be unneighbourly. A response is awaited and a verbal report will be made.

4.9 In respect of the rights of the applicants and the occupiers of neighbouring properties to peaceful enjoyment of their homes it is considered that the recommendation to permit subject to the conditions specified and satisfactory amended plans being received is justified and proportionate.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**PERMIT**

1. A01F   Time Limit - Full
2. F01F   Materials/Finishes
3. U34211 No more windows

**INFORMATIVES**

1. U34212 Informative: Reasons
2. U34213 Informative: Plans

For further information on this application please contact Richard Dixon on 01243 534734
15. **SB/08/00183/COU**

**Proposal**  Use of former grain stores for the pressing and processing of rape seed and waste vegetable oil to produce biodiesel.

**Site**  Priors Leaze Farm Priors Leaze Lane Hambrook Chidham Chichester West Sussex PO18 8RQ

**Map Ref**  (E) 478332 (N) 106311

**Applicant**  Chichester Grain Ltd

---

NOT TO SCALE  Note: Do not scale from map. For information only. Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Crown Copyright. License No. 100018803
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Ref/Per</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74/0085/SB</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Addition of first floor office for agricultural use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/00004/SB</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>Grain dryer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/00005/SB</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>4 no. grain silos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88/00148/SB</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Renewal - portakabin to be used as an office extension, situated within existing lean-to building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89/00112/SB</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>O/L - Erection of double grain and crop store steel frame - natural grey fibre cladding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89/00260/SB</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Demolition of garage and erection of single grain and crop store and extension to existing grain store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/02411/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Retention of hardstanding for vehicle turning/parking open grain storage and other uses ancillary to Chicheser Grain Ltd. in common with existing agricultural use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/00211/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Erection of grain and crop store and conditioning plant as a variation from previously approved building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/01946/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Weighbridge office abutting existing laboratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/00193/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Hardstanding for grain holding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/02530/FUL</td>
<td>REVOKE</td>
<td>Additional grain storage facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00772/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Flat grain storage buildings in lieu of grain storage silos (approval ref SB/97/02530/FUL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01091/FUL</td>
<td>PER106</td>
<td>Three flat grain storage buildings in lieu of grain storage silos (approval Ref: SB/97/02530/FUL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01449/COU</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Temporary use of one grain store for the dry storage of pre-treated soil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03127/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Variation of condition 1 of planning permission SB/01/01449/COU to allow extension of the temporary time period for an additional 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01902/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Grain hopper, drier, silo and feed conveyor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02772/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Erect telecommunications installation comprising 20m high steel monopole accommodating 3 no. antennae and 2 no. microwave dishes with associated equipment cabinets located within fenced compound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/00210/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Variation of condition 1 of planning permission SB/01/03127/FUL to allow extension of temporary time period for an additional 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01071/REN</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Renewal of temporary consent for use of grain store for storage of soil for a further 5 no. years (previous consent SB/03/00210/FUL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/00040/COU</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Use of former grain store for the processing of rape seed to produce biodegradeable diesel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/02322/COU</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Change of use of former grain store for B8 purposes (storage and distribution of sailing clothing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/00183/COU</td>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>Use of former grain stores for the pressing and processing of rape seed and waste vegetable oil to produce biodiesel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constraints

- Listed Building: NO
- Conservation Area: NO
- Rural Area: YES
- AONB: NO
- Strategic Gap: YES
- Tree Preservation Order: NO
- Proposed South Downs: NO
- National Park: NO
- Flood Zone 2: NO
- Historic Parks and Gardens: NO

1.0 Reason for Committee Referral

Parish Objection - Officer recommends Permit

2.0 Representations and Consultations

2.1 Parish Council

Southbourne Parish Council:
Southbourne Parish Council objects to the application for the following reasons:
The road is not suitable for the number and size of heavy vehicles the proposed use would generate to visit the site.
The site is not in the right area for an industrial use of this nature
The proposed use is inappropriate for a non-industrial site which has only been used for storage purposes in the past
There are concerns about possible smells emanating from the process

Chidham Parish Council:
Chidham Parish Council objects to the application. Although this site is not actually within the boundaries of Chidham parish, this planning application, if approved, will strongly affect Chidham parishioners.

Chidham Parish Council objects strongly to this planning application as Priors Leaze Lane is a narrow rural road lacking footways to protect pedestrians against the heavy vehicular traffic that would be generated by this change of use. The existing heavy traffic to this unit has problems negotiating the junction of Priors Leaze Lane and Broad Road and has cut great ruts in the grass verge.

The Council notes the applicant's statement that 'the end product is more or less odour free and therefore there is very little odour emitted through the process' but considers this to be a remarkably
vague statement to make about an industrial process being set up in the middle of a residential area, particularly when the process involves waste vegetable oil, i.e. old chip fat.

The Council notes that the applicant also states 'there remains very little fire risk' when referring to the end product, but makes no reference to the fire risk from the methanol and methylate.

The Council queries the statement by the applicant that 'movements into the site will remain unchanged', as no account has been made of the deliveries of the waste vegetable oil and the methanol and methylate, and the removal of any end waste product.

The Council are concerned that this application is for yet further industrialisation in a strategic gap, and so objects strongly to the proposal.

2.2 Environment Agency

Has no objection in principle as long as the operators adhere to the permit that has been issued by the Environment Agency in order to prevent pollution.

2.3 Southern Water Services

Does not wish to comment.

2.4 WSCC - Strategic Planning

Does not wish to comment.

2.5 WSCC Highways & Transport Services

Response dated 18.04.08
Based on the information submitted the existing permitted uses on the site have the potential to generate up to 830 vehicle movements from grain alone [which works out to approximately 15 movements per week]. The bulk of these movements [approximately 600] would occur after a very short period seasonally during harvesting. The grain store then generates a further 230 HGV movements as the grain is exported.

These figures do not appear to include the oil seed rape that is indicated to also be stored on the site, although it is not apparent whether the storage of rape seed occurred in conjunction with the grain storage or whether this is a recent development since the grain storage has ceased. It is, however, apparent that the movements associated with oil seed rape will continue as they appear to be at present, i.e. that 420 movements will result. As the agent has indicated, if the oil seed rape is not processed on site there may be further vehicle movements.

On the understanding that the storage of grain is to cease completely on the site [a fact not made clear as the submitted block plan only has in red edging the actual unit itself, leaving a substantial part of the site unaccounted for and the use of which is not clear], the processing of oil would appear to offer a substantial reduction in traffic movements. In total, the processing of oil is indicated to generate approximately 244 vehicle movements [4 per week on average], which would be spread more evenly throughout the year and would not have such an intense period as the former grain store would. Indeed the delivery of oil alone would appear to only account for a single HGV two-way movement per week. Taking into account the oil seed rape too, then in total there would appear to be 664 movements per year [12 per week], which is less than the grain store.
On that basis, whilst the road network leading to the site is not appropriate for the types of traffic accessing the site, with due consideration to the existing permitted use this proposal does offer a potential reduction in traffic generation, and it is appreciated that the existing permitted use may be restarted at any given time. In light of this it is difficult to resist the proposal on highway grounds. However, as the red edging on the block plan only covers a small area it is considered appropriate that the applicant should be requested to confirm the other uses that would remain within the overall grain storage complex, and specifically to confirm that the grain storage use is to completely cease.

29.04.08
The agent has confirmed that there are a number of existing uses that will remain within the site. Traffic movements associated with these uses will, therefore, not alter as a result of this application. Therefore, with due consideration of the change of use, this would result in marginally lower flows of traffic. Nevertheless based on the information submitted it does signify a reduction in the total number of vehicle movements.

Whilst I would reiterate my comments regarding the inappropriate nature of the surrounding road network to accommodate HGV traffic, with due consideration of the existing, permitted uses on the site, the change of use would result in a less intensive use of the site and would generate fewer traffic movements. On that basis, it would be difficult to resist this proposal from a highway perspective and no objection would be raised.

2.6 WSCC - Fire Officer

Response awaited. [Consulted 21.01.08 - reminders were sent on 06.05.08 and 27.05.08].

2.7 CDC - Environmental Health Officer

04.02.08
No objections with respect to contaminated land or air quality issues. It is noted that a permit is required from the Environment Agency to carry out the process. Standard condition N22F should be applied in order that the process will not cause new contamination.

20.02.08
It is appreciated that the process has been granted a Permit by the Environment Agency and that section 3.4 of that Permit seeks to control the odour emitted from the site. The standard must be at least equivalent to that used for Statutory Nuisance. There is no noise data given for the process and so I require an assessment following the methodology of BS 4142:1997 with the aim of ensuring that any noise created by the process does not increase the background noise as measured at the nearest residential property.

05.06.08
It is considered that the Permit from the Environment Agency should be sufficient to control the odour from the process. My second requirement was an assessment to BS: 4142:1997 to ensure that the noise created by the development did not increase background noise. The letter from the agent simply says that nuisance will not be caused by a diesel generator and a compressor and this is not the same as providing the required assessment. Therefore, I cannot accept the agent's submission.

2.8 CDC - Economic Development Manager

This farm diversification proposal is supported by the Economic Development Service as the project will assist farming in the district by complimenting farmers' income streams, ensuring the future sustainability of the agricultural workforce and their activities.
2.9 CDC - Environmental Strategy Unit

The environmental benefits of biofuels diminish rapidly the further that the crop has to travel for processing and the further that the product has to be transported for use. Environmental benefits are maximised where local crops and processing are available and for this reason the Environmental Strategy Unit supports this application as no local biofuel from crops is available in the District. The extent to which the re-use of buildings on-farm adds to the environmental benefits depends on the ratio between crops brought in from the fields and those trucked in from elsewhere and this was not entirely clear from the submitted details. The Environment Agency Permit addresses the environmental pollution concerns raised in the previous application.

2.10 25 Third Party Objections

Main points are:

Agent's supporting letter inaccurate in many respects
Increased traffic/heavy commercial traffic
Increased traffic danger
Increased danger to pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders, children
Lack of pavements
Lane too narrow
Lane is rat run
Present lorry traffic unacceptable
Lorry traffic will be in addition to present heavy vehicle traffic from local businesses
Alternative access route needed
Submitted details on vehicle numbers/movements incorrect
Traffic will not decrease
Submitted highway benefit argument flawed
Associated traffic will be all year round [unlike grain traffic]
Hindrance to quick safe access for emergency vehicles
Possible leakage on to surface of lane
Increased damage from traffic
Effects of traffic on houses
Should remain a grain store
Inappropriate in Rural Area [industrial use]
Should be in industrial area/ on an industrial estate
Recent changes at site not connected to rural economy
Could have little or no agricultural benefit
Few jobs could be created/supported
Little use to local agriculture
No material change from previous refusal
Contrary to Local Plan
There should be an Environmental Statement
There is no Screening Opinion
Environment Agency Permit is no substitute for Environmental Impact Assessment
Inadequacies of Environment Agency Permit
Environment Agency Permit appears bogus
Environment Agency Permit inaccurate
Any permission should be withheld pending reply to Hambrook and District Residents Association from Environment Agency regarding Permit
Permit takes no account of levels of bio - diesel production
Environmental issues not well enough addressed
Environmental risk
Pollution risk to Ham Brook
Adverse effects on human health
Will possibly worsen allergies
Will add to stress
Fire Hazard [plus toxic fumes in fire]
End by-product chemicals flammable
Safety Hazard
Dirty Glycerine [a by-product], methylate and methanol are flammable and give off deadly toxins
View of Fire Brigade should have been sought
By - products are dangerous
Waste vegetable oil and by - products will be stored [e.g. methanol] which are hazardous
Dangerous use/should not be near dwellings
Increased air pollution
Increased smell/fumes
Toxic gas risk
Increased health risk
Increased danger to humans from chemicals etc
Inadequate information [e.g. on by-products]
There are no details of safety/accident management measures
Health and Safety Executive should have been consulted
CDC Health and Safety section should have been consulted
Disturbance from traffic
Increased noise
Proximity to houses [within 100m ]
Detrimental to amenity of area/local residents
Inefficient as a fuel
Advantages/disadvantages of bio-fuel not fully known
Bio-fuels may not help reduce global warming and may increase it
Bio-diesel increasingly considered not environmentally friendly
Sustainability of making bio - diesel from oil seed rape not proven [government review in progress]
Cannot guarantee supply of rape seed will be local
Will be mainly waste cooking oil used [as with McDonalds scheme]
Cumulative effect
Use may expand
There is no decommissioning plan
Possible non-compliance with conditions
As a possible end - user the District Council is not objective
If WSCC is to be a customer it is questionable whether it is independent in advising on application

2.11 Applicants Supporting Information

The application follows on from a previous refusal [SB/07/00040/COU] for use for the processing of rape seed to produce biodegradable diesel of one of the two units subject of the current application. In the current proposal the northern - most of the two buildings would be used for the storage of oil seed rape and crushing and extracting the oil only. The resultant oil would be stored in tanks inside this building. The second building, which is currently surplus to Chichester Grain Ltd's requirements would be used for the esterification process.

Chichester Grain Ltd have an agreement to rent to Convert 2 Green, who operate a business taking waste vegetable oil and esterifying it into Bio-Diesel. The cooking oil is supplied by a company called 3663.
Convert 2 Green will also esterify the rape oil produced by Chichester Grain Ltd. The Bio-Diesel will be sold in one ton containers, principally to West Sussex County Council and Chichester District Council.

The importation of rape seed would remain unaltered from past operations and would be sourced locally from farms in West Sussex and East Hampshire. The incoming pattern of vehicles would remain unchanged.

The seed would be cleaned, weighed and pressed to extract the virgin rape seed oil. This oil would then be piped from the northern grain store in to the central building and would pass through the transesterification process which comprises chemically reacting the vegetable oil with alcohol in the presence of a catalyst which produces the Bio-Diesel fuel. The biodegradable diesel would then be taken to a vented storage area from where it can be distributed. The end product is not volatile to combustion by flame and is only combustible under pressure and therefore there is little fire risk.

The end product is also odour free. The buildings and processing area will be fully bunded to contain spillages as outlined in the Environment Agency's Permit.

The process would involve storage of up to 10 tons of methanol and methylate, which would be stored within 1000 litre containers and kept in the vented storage area to the rear of the building. The process would also require the storage of up to 30 tons of glycerine and 60 tons of Bio-Diesel and this will be stored in 30,000 litre tanks kept within the internal walled area in a location next to the transesterification process.

The area of processing is limited to approximately 200 to 300 square metres and is thus below the threshold in the Town and Country Planning [Environmental Impact Assessment] [England and Wales] Regulations 1999 at which an Environmental Statement is required.

The importation of rape seed historically has generated approximately 300 HGV movements per annum, comprising 150 movements into the site and 150 movements out. Movements in to the site will remain unchanged, and movements out will be decreased by means of processing the rape seed oil on site, whereby it would be outsourced for local use and locally distributed. Therefore highway benefits will accrue in terms of a reduction in traffic miles and HGV movements out of the site.

The benefits of producing Bio-Diesel are significant as it is an environmentally friendly process and the proposal represents diversification of the farming enterprise. The proposal, therefore, complies with National Guidance and Local Plan policies, particularly policies RE12 and RE14.

The process would initially only involve 3/4 employees on site and therefore there would be little difference in activity.

The process itself has been granted a Permit by the Environment Agency and it would be the intention to vary the licence to accord with the current planning application proposal. The Environment Agency Licence does, however, confirm the use is acceptable and appropriate and can be undertaken without any adverse effect upon the local environment.

### 3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 The site is in the Rural Area and a designated Strategic Gap in the Chichester District Local Plan First Review 1999. Relevant 'saved' policies of the Development Plan are policies CH1, CH3, DEV1, DEV3, DEV4, DEV5, ERA1, ERA2, ERA4, ERA5, LOC2, NE8 and NE13 of the West Sussex Structure Plan First Review 1999 and policies RE1, RE6, RE7, RE8, RE12, RE14, BE11, BE14, BE16, TR6 and TR8 of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review 1999.
3.2 The following Objectives in the Community Strategy 2006-2016 are relevant:

B.1 - Transport - Minimise congestion on main roads to improve journey times, safety and reduce "rat running" traffic.

B.3 - Transport - Ensure that safe access to schools is available by walking, cycling and public transport, and reduce the impact of school traffic on congestion.

B.4 - Transport - Ensure that the transport network improves the efficiency of local businesses, and that the impact of goods vehicles in sensitive areas is minimised.

B.6 - Transport - Ensure that those living in rural areas can get to and use those services they need and the impact of traffic on these areas is reduced.

B.7 - Transport - Ensure that the visual appearance and attraction of our city, town and village centres is maintained and enhanced.

D.4 - Community Safety - Work together with local people to make cleaner, safer, greener communities, tackling neighbourhood issues and improving the local environment.

E.8 - Health & Well-being - Tackle environmental impacts on health including housing, pollution, traffic, noise and run down neighbourhoods.

E.10 - Health & Well-being - Promote health and well-being in the workplace.

F.1 - The Environment - Encourage and support residents to further reduce waste, minimise energy and water use, and to use sustainable modes of transport.

F.2 - The Environment - Encourage and support businesses and organisations to reduce their environmental impact, including waste management, sustainable use of resources and sourcing of local products.

F.3 - The Environment - Raise awareness of the causes and impacts of climate change across all sectors of the community and businesses, and work to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and adapt to the implications of climate change.

F.4. - The Environment - Reduce the risk of flooding and develop strategic coastal defence options.

F.5 - The Environment - Identify and promote opportunities to protect and enhance the District's variety of wildlife and heritage.

F.6 - The Environment - Help combat environmental crime such as fly tipping and pollution and work to create cleaner, safer, greener communities.

F.7 - The Environment - Reduce the impacts of new development by ensuring it is sustainable and that all new development delivers benefits for the natural environment.

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

G.1 - The Economy - Support business in creating a strong and diverse economy that is appropriate to the nature of the District.
G.2 - The Economy - Establish our District as a leading place for innovation and entrepreneurship.

G.4 - The Economy - Seek to improve the District's infrastructure including transport links, and increasing the availability of sites and premises for businesses and improving their quality.

G.5 - The Economy - Enable businesses to grow in an environmentally sustainable and socially responsible manner.

3.3 Government policy contained in PPS22 Renewable Energy is particularly relevant:

Renewable energy developments should be capable of being accommodated throughout England in locations where the technology is viable and environmental, economic, and social impacts can be addressed satisfactorily.

The wider environmental and economic benefits of all proposals for renewable energy projects, whatever their scale, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be granted planning permission.

Small-scale projects can provide a limited but valuable contribution to overall outputs of renewable energy and to meeting energy needs both locally and nationally. Planning authorities should not therefore reject planning applications simply because the level of output is small.

For biomass projects, the need to transport crops to the energy production plant does have the potential to lead to increases in traffic. Local planning authorities should make sure that the effects of such increases are minimised by ensuring that generation plants are located in as close a proximity as possible to the sources of fuel that have been identified.

4.0 Planning Comments

Background

4.1 The application buildings are two in a complex of buildings and silos on the north western side of Priors Leaze Lane and are grey, metal clad pitch roofed buildings at the north eastern end and centre of a line of three similar buildings which face gable end on towards the lane. The complex of buildings and silos is approached by a vehicular access from Priors Leaze Lane which crosses Ham Brook which runs along the north western edge of the lane between the lane and the complex. To the east of the subject buildings is a bungalow and an access control point. To the north and north east within the complex of buildings are further buildings and large tanks. The complex of buildings, tanks and silos is primarily a grain storage plant. There is a hedge/tree screen on the frontage of the complex. On the opposite side of the lane are residential and business premises.

4.2 The proposal is to use the two buildings as described in paragraph 2.11 above so that biodiesel is produced from rape seed and waste vegetable oil. The application includes a copy of a Permit from the Environment Agency under the Pollution Prevention and Control [England and Wales] Regulations 2000. This permit appears to relate to only one of the buildings and to production of Bio -Diesel from rape seed only so it will need to be varied to meet the current proposed process.

4.3 The grain storage complex benefited from permission for silos in the 1970's and further grain storage facilities in the following 3 decades. The row of three buildings which includes the two buildings subject of the application under consideration was first permitted as grain storage buildings in 1999. The temporary change of use of the south western most of the three buildings, i.e. the building to the south west of the two buildings subject of the current application, to storage of pre-
treated soil was permitted in September 2001 [reference SB/01/01449/COU] and through subsequent permissions this use was permitted to continue until 04.05.2009 [the last permission was reference SB/04/01071/REN]. However, permission was granted in 2007 for change of use of this building to storage and distribution of sailing clothing, [reference SB/07/02322/COU].

4.4 The main issues in this case are firstly, whether the use is acceptable in the Rural Area/Strategic Gap, secondly, highway issues, and thirdly effects on the amenity and safety of local residents.

Issue 1

4.5 Taking the issue of whether the use is acceptable in the Rural Area/Strategic Gap, in order to encourage the provision of additional employment opportunities, Policies RE12 and RE14 of the Local Plan permit diversification and change of use in the Rural Area provided they are not damaging to nature conservation interests; they will not be damaging/obtrusive in the landscape; they will not unacceptably affect the amenities of adjacent residents; they are not contrary to policies for countryside protection; the resulting type and level of activity would not be harmful to the character of the area; the type and level of activity proposed would not be detrimental to the character of the rural road network, surrounding area, amenity of local residents or other users of the countryside; and the means of access and parking provision are satisfactory and various other tests.

4.6 In general terms it is considered that the proposal meets these criteria and is therefore acceptable in the Rural Area. Some of these criteria relate to highway issues and effects on local residents, and as explained below, the Highway Authority has no objection to the proposal, and the recommendation below anticipates that the Environmental Heath Officer will confirm that he has no objection to the proposal by the Committee date. As regards any argument that the proposal does not need a rural location and is therefore contrary to policies LOC2 and NE8 of the Structure Plan, the buildings are already existing in the Rural Area, policies RE12 and RE14 of the Local Plan specifically allow such conversions, and the agent states that the rape seed is sourced locally from farms within West Sussex and East Hampshire indicating a local rural connection. Government policy as expressed in PPS7 supports the re-use of appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes where this would meet sustainable development objectives.

4.7 The principal purpose of Strategic Gaps as expressed in policies CH3 of the Structure Plan and RE6 of the Local Plan is to retain the identity of settlements through the prevention of settlement coalescence. As the buildings involved in this application are already in existence, the proposal will have no significant implications for Strategic Gap policy.

Issue 2

4.8 As regards highway issues the applicant's agent was asked to comment on the matters raised by the Highway Authority in its initial consultation response which mainly related to clarification as to the existing and proposed levels of vehicle movements. The agent responded on 08.04.08 that as regards existing traffic movements each of the grain stores presently holds 3,000 tons of wheat which is delivered to the premises by approximately 300 tractors and trailers during harvesting time over a 6 week period between July and August. Tractors and trailers come in full and go out empty, which equates to 600 movements per grain store. The wheat is taken out by 115 lorries over a 6 month period and as these are only one-way loads, this means the doubling of the movement to 230. He therefore said that total HGV movements at present are 830 [i.e. 600 + 230].

4.9 As regards the proposed use, the agent continued that the esterification of 2.5 million litres of cooking/rape oil would involve approximately 50 lorry loads of waste oil being delivered to the site and that these lorries would load up with bio-diesel and go out full, which means that the total lorry
movements equate to 100. He stated that there would also be 50 lorries entering the site empty and
going out full, totalling 100 movements. He therefore affirmed total HGV movements in this respect
over the year to be 200.

4.10 However, the agent continued that there would also be a need for 10 lorry loads of methanol to
be bought on to the site, 2 lorry loads of methylate, and 10 lorry loads of glycerole to go out of the
site, producing an additional 44 movements over the 52 week period. When this is added to the 200
HGV movements mentioned in the preceding paragraph one gets 244.

4.11 The agent went on to state that 7000 tons of oil rape seed is currently stored on the site, that this
would be crushed to make virgin oil and stored in tanks inside the building, and that this equates to 2.5
million litres of oil, approximately half of which would be sold as virgin rape seed oil. The virgin rape
seed oil would come back onto site as used cooking oil to be esterified to produce bio-diesel while the
other half would be piped to the central grain store to again provide bio-diesel. The agent stated that in
connection with this process there would be 50 lorry movements to take the virgin oil out, which
equates to 100 in total, and 160 lorry movements to transport rape meal, which equates to 320 in total,
and that if the oil rape seed was not processed it would be exported by 250 lorries to Erith in Kent
producing 500 lorry movements. The agent concluded that processing of the oil rape seed to virgin oil
on the site and the production of bio-diesel would, therefore, result in reduced levels of HGV
movements.

4.12 The Highway Authority was reconsulted on the agent's response and responded on 18.04.08 that
if the storage of grain is to cease in the wider storage complex, the processing of oil would appear to
offer a substantial reduction in traffic movements which would make the proposal difficult to resist on
traffic grounds. However, the Highway Authority went on to point out that the application site is only
a small part of the overall storage complex, and that it is not in fact clear what use is proposed for the
remainder of the storage complex. Therefore, the Highway Authority requested that the applicant
should confirm which other uses would remain in the rest of the storage complex and specifically that
the grain storage use therein is to completely cease. The applicant's agent was requested to respond to
this and replied on 24.04.08 that the other grain stores still used for grain storage would continue to be
used for such and therefore related traffic movements will remain unchanged.

4.13 Therefore, the Highway Authority was reconsulted further and replied on 29.04.08 that in view
of the overall marginally lower flows of traffic/vehicle movements, no objection is raised despite the
inappropriate nature of the surrounding road network. Your officers have considered the information
submitted in respect of the existing (fallback) and the proposed traffic growth. Comparison of these is
difficult and relies on a wide range of assumptions. It is, however, reasonable to conclude that the
proposed use is likely to generate no more HGV traffic than the lawful maximum use for grain
storage.

Issue 3

4.14 As regards effects on the amenity and safety of local residents, the Environment Agency has
granted a Permit under the Pollution Prevention and Control [England and Wales] Regulations 2000
albeit for only one of the buildings and for production of Bio - Diesel from rape seed only. This
Permit will need varying but in any event the Environment Agency has stated that it has no objection
to the current planning application provided that the provisions of the Permit are adhered to. On the
advice of the Environmental Health Officer the recommendation below includes a condition aimed at
preventing future contamination of land or water as the result of the process.

4.15 The agent has also pointed out that the Health and Safety Executive will be advised of the
proposal and that any comments that body may raise will be taken in to account by the applicant.
4.16 In his consultation response of 20.02.08 the Environmental Health Officer raised concerns in respect of noise and odour and the applicant's agent was requested to respond thereto. The agent responded on 05.06.08 by stating that odour would be minimal and controlled by the Environment Agency in Section 3.4 of the Permit and that the standard will be at least equivalent to that used for Statutory Nuisance. The agent continued that there will be two main sources of noise. Firstly there would be a diesel generator located outdoors which would be acoustically noise suppressed producing 68Fdb at 1m distance and secondly, there would be an air compressor situated indoors which would produce 69db at 1m distance. The agent stated that it has been confirmed to him that these noise levels will not cause nuisance.

4.17 The Environmental Health Officer was reconsulted on, and replied on, 05.06.08. He stated that it was considered that the Environment Agency Permit should be sufficient to control the odour from the process. However, he continued that his second requirement was receipt of an assessment to BS 4142:1997 to ensure that the noise created by the process did not increase background noise whereas the agent's response does not do this but simply says that nuisance will not be caused by the diesel generator and compressor. This is not considered sufficient information and, therefore, the Environmental Health Officer does not find the agent's letter of 05.06.08 to be satisfactory. Therefore, the agent has been requested to provide the necessary noise assessment and the recommendation below assumes receipt thereof and comment from the Environmental Health Officer to the effect there is no objection as regards noise by the date of Committee.

4.18 The Fire Officer was also consulted [on 21.01.08] and no response has been received at the time of writing.

Other Matters

4.19 As regards other matters, the agent has stated that the submission of an Environmental Statement is not required as the production area is below the threshold area in the Town and Country Planning [Environmental Impact Assessment] [England and Wales] Regulations 1999. The most relevant part of these Regulations appears to be Schedule 2, paragraph 2, section 6 which relates to the chemical industry and sets a threshold of 1,000sqm of new floorspace in respect of treatment of intermediate products and production of chemicals or production of pesticides and pharmaceutical products, paint and varnishes, elastomers and peroxides. The agent's view could be seen as correct on the basis that the production area would be 200 - 300sqm whereas the threshold in Schedule 2 is that the area of new floorspace exceeds 1,000sqm. Furthermore in this instance the floorspace itself is existing rather than new, [albeit that a new use is proposed].

4.20 Schedule 2, paragraph 2, section 6 also relates to storage facilities for petroleum, petrochemical and chemical products where the area of any new building or structure exceeds 0.05ha or more than 200 tonnes of petroleum, petrochemical or chemical products would be stored at any one time. However, although the area of the buildings exceeds 0.05ha, the application proposal is not for a new building or structure and the agent has confirmed in his letter of 05.06.08 that less than 200 tonnes of petroleum, petrochemical or chemical products are going to be stored at any one time.

4.21 Alternatively, if one accepts that the proposal falls within the thresholds of Schedule 2 paragraph 2,6, e.g. on the basis that the proposal is for treatment of intermediate products and production of chemicals and that the area of new floorspace exceeds 1,000sqm, [despite the fact that the buildings themselves are already existing], or alternatively on the basis that the proposal is for storage facilities for petroleum, petrochemical and chemical products where the area of any new building or structure exceeds 0.05ha, [despite the fact the buildings themselves are already existing], the site is not 'sensitive' in the meaning of the Regulations, the nature of the proposal is relatively small scale, and subject to any outstanding consultation responses its environmental impact does not appear to be significant.
4.22 Furthermore, the proposal involves storage of well less than 100,000 tonnes of fuel and the chemicals involved have not resulted in advice from consultees that the proposal is particularly hazardous and, therefore, on the basis of the guidelines indicated by Circular 02/99 there does not appear to be a need for an Environmental Statement. The submission of the Permit from the Environment Agency means that more information was submitted than in the previously submitted unsuccessful application.

4.23 The agent was asked to respond on the ratio between crops brought in from the fields and those trucked in from elsewhere and to indicate the percentage of bio-diesel that would be produced from rape seed and the percentage that would be produced from waste vegetable oil. He has responded by confirming that at present the grain stores accept the rape seed from the local farming community and it is only the processing of the product which is different from the current operations. He continues that it is proposed to have a 50/50 ratio of virgin rape oil and to use cooking oil initially to produce the bio-diesel. Currently the rape price is very high, which limits its inclusion, but as the price is expected to fall in the near future while diesel prices continue to rise, it will mean that rape oil will become more attractive as a fuel and therefore the ratio will alter accordingly.

4.24 In any event, paragraph 20 of Planning and Climate Change, the Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 states that Local Planning Authorities should 'not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such a development must be sited in a particular location.' Furthermore, policy BE16 of the Local Plan states 'The District Planning Authority will encourage energy conservation and energy efficiency.'

RECOMMENDATION

PERMIT

1 A01F Time Limit - Full
2 B01F No Departure from Plans
3 U30856 Use Restriction
4 U30864 Hours Of Use
5 U30860 External Lighting Restriction
6 U30861 Refuse Storage And Cycle Storage
7 U30862 Parking Etc
8 N22F Contaminated Land
9 D14F No Objectionable Machinery/Process
10 E18F Noise Control Machinery
11 E17F Sound Insulation Machinery
12 E15F Music/Public Address System Restrictions

INFORMATIVES

1 W01F Informative: Disclaimer - Other Consents
2 U30696 Informative: Summary of Reasons
3 U29623 Informative: Relevant Plans

For further information on this application please contact David Trevis on 01243 534734
16. **SB/08/01378/DOM**

**Proposal**  Proposed outbuilding to house playroom to be located south east of the site.

**Site**  Claybourne Prinsted Lane Prinsted Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8HS

**Map Ref**  (E) 476548 (N) 105151

**Applicant**  Mr R Parker
**History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89/00054/SB</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td>Outline one bungalow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/00084/SB</td>
<td>APPWDN</td>
<td>New chalet bungalow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92/00022/SB</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>One chalet bungalow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92/00112/SB</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Alteration of garage form a pyramid to a barn hip. Insertion of roof light, use of roof space for storage purposes and use of part of garage to form utility room. Resiting of chimney &amp; resiting of another chimney. Insertion of door to utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/00107/DOM</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Single storey extension to dining room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/00305/COU</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Change of Use from paddock to garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/01731/DOM</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Change of use of store room to study (room in the roof) - new dormer &amp; window to existing bedroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01378/DOM</td>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>Proposed outbuilding to house playroom to be located south east of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01379/DOM</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Proposed west extension, to extend living room. Ridge to link garage raised, and wall extended on ground floor. Proposed garage door be replaced with windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94/00089/COND</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>Change of Use from paddock to garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/00284/CONBC</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>Enforcement Enquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints**

- Listed Building: NO
- Conservation Area: NO
- Rural Area: YES
- AONB: YES
- Strategic Gap: YES
- Tree Preservation Order: NO
- Proposed South Downs: NO
- National Park: NO
- Flood Zone 2: YES
- Historic Parks and Gardens: NO

**1.0 Reason for Committee Referral**

Parish Objection - Officer Recommends Permit

**2.0 Representations and Consultations**

**2.1 Parish Council**

(Original Plans)
No response

(Substitute Plans)
Southbourne Parish Council objects to the application for the following reasons: Overdevelopment of plot, the proposed building is considered too high, unneighbourly.
2.2 Chichester Harbour Conservancy

(Original Plans)
Objection

(Substitute Plans)
The application has now been amended in order to address the concerns of the case officer regarding the scale of the building and the range of accommodation provided. The building now proposed would be single-storey only, providing a table tennis/sitting area and a shower room/toilet, and the agent has confirmed that it would not be a habitable room or let out as holiday accommodation. The building has been reduced in height by 2 metres to 3.9 metres high with a simple, instead of a 'barn-style', pitched and clay tiled roof. The building would now form an L-shape rather than a rectangle, measuring a maximum of 7.2 metres long and 8.4 metres wide.

The reduced scale of the building and consequent reduced level of accommodation successfully overcomes the Conservancy's previous concern regarding the ease with which the building could be used as a separate dwelling in the countryside, and its over-dominant relationship with the main house. The revised building, due to its significantly reduced height, would be sufficiently ancillary to the main dwelling, and would no longer be visible within the wider landscape. As such, and on the basis of the revised plan, the Conservancy wishes to remove its objection, subject to a condition being imposed upon any permission restricting the occupancy of the building to ancillary use only.

2.3 Environment Agency

(Original Plans)
Objection - The application has been submitted without a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).

(Substitute Plans)
No objection subject to condition to ensure the building is ancillary to the existing dwelling and not used as habitable accommodation.

2.4 6 Third Party Objections (2 have written twice)

Closeness to boundary
Overbuilding
Noise
Shutting out of light
Overlooking from first floor window in north elevation
Proposed building will make surface water run-off worse
Look very built up and harmful to character
Cause water run-off
Increased pressure on drainage
Obstruct view of trees
Increase flooding
Overdevelopment

2.5 Agents Supporting Information (extracts from letter dated 1st May 2008)

The outbuilding will be used in addition to the main house as an annexe for a table tennis space. This will not be a habitable room and the building will not be let out as holiday accommodation.

The windows on the first floor facing north have been removed, and replaced with high level velux windows to the east and west elevations.

117
The ridge height of the proposal has been reduced by 1500mm to respond to your request for a reduced ridge height. We have also reduced the width of the development by 300m in order to achieve the above, and to reduce the footprint on the site. The development is now 'L' shaped in order to relieve the massing from Seawinds, and to provide no overlooking issues.

I can confirm that the applicant owns the site, although there is no visible boundary between Claybourne and Harbour Side. Therefore no Certificate B is required.

Find enclosed a flood risk assessment (FRA) required, following your email yesterday.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 The main relevant policies from the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 are DEV1, CH2, CH3.

3.2 The main relevant policies from the Chichester District Council Local Plan, First Review 1999 are RE4, RE6, BE11.

3.3 The relevant strategy from the Council's Community Strategy is:

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

4.0 Planning Comments

4.1 The proposal is to construct an outbuilding in the south east corner of the site to provide a recreation/games room with a shower room to be used in conjunction with the main dwelling on the site. The main dwelling is a chalet bungalow sited in a backland position to the west of Prinsted Lane. The application site lies predominantly in the Settlement Policy Area for Prinsted, however the south east corner of the site lies within the rural area, and the designated strategic gap which adjoins the SPA. The proposed out building would also lie within Flood Risk Zone 2 and 3.

4.2 The proposed building would be L-shaped with a ridge height of approx. 3.8m and a length of 8.3m and a depth of approx. 5.1m, increasing to approx. 7.3m. The building would be single storey only with the primary fenestration being patio doors on the north elevation, there are also smaller windows proposed on the east and west elevations and 2 rooflights proposed on the west elevation. Negotiations took place during the course of the application and the scheme has been amended in order to satisfy the concerns of the LPA regarding the use of the building, the impact upon neighbours and the impact upon flood risk.

4.3 The main considerations are whether the proposal would; 1) be ancillary to the main dwelling, 2) increase flood risk, 3) have an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbours, and 4) have a harmful impact upon the visual amenity of the street scene or the rural character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty wider area.

Issue 1 & 2

4.4 As originally submitted the proposal comprised of a play room with toilet on the ground floor and a bedroom with ensuite bathroom above. The LPA were concerned that the proposal constituted a new dwelling in the rural area which would be contrary to policy, whilst the Environment Agency objected to the proposal because no flood risk assessment was submitted. The EA also advised that any proposal including habitable accommodation would increase the number of people at risk during an
extreme tidal event and therefore the development would not be safe, it was therefore unlikely that the EA would remove their objection even if a FRA was submitted.

4.5 The revised proposal, which is now under consideration, is single storey and comprises of a play room with shower room only. The agent has confirmed that the proposed building would be used as a play/games room only in connection with the main dwelling and that it would not be used for habitable accommodation. The EA have now withdrawn their objection and a condition is recommended to ensure the building would remain ancillary to the main dwelling and to ensure the building is not used for habitable accommodation.

Issue 3

4.6 The boundary between the application site and the neighbouring dwelling to the south, known as Harbourside, is not currently defined on the ground, however it has been confirmed that the proposal would not encroach on land outside the ownership of the applicant. The plans show that a close-boarded fence 1.8m in height would be erected to the south and west of the proposed building to provide a formal boundary. The proposed fence would ensure that the 3 narrow windows on the west elevation would not result in overlooking of the neighbouring garden, and due to the siting and design of the proposed outbuilding it would not have a significant impact upon the occupiers of Harbourside.

4.7 To the east of the proposed building there are 2 garages, garden land and parking areas for the neighbouring dwelling known as 'Seawinds' and 'Waterside'. The proposed outbuilding would be lower than both of the neighbouring garages, and due to the siting of the proposed building approx. 13m from Seawind and Waterside the proposal would not have an overbearing impact. The proposal would also not result in overlooking due to the position of the proposed windows and the boundary treatment which comprises of a fence and hedging approx. 1.8-2m in height.

Issue 4

4.8 The proposed outbuilding would be visible from Prinsted Lane between the dwellings fronting the road, however due to the position of the building set back from the road, and the size and design of the building which would be subservient to the main dwelling and the neighbouring buildings, the proposal would not have a significant impact upon the street scene or the character of the surrounding Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

4.9 In respect of the European Convention of Human Rights, the rights of both the applicant, the occupiers of the neighbouring property and of the wider community have been considered when reaching a decision to recommend that planning permission is granted. It is considered that for the reasons explained above that the recommendation is justified and proportionate in this case.
RECOMMENDATION
PERMIT

1  A01F  Time Limit - Full
2  B01F  No Departure from Plans
3  F01F  Materials/Finishes
3  F11F  Windows and Doors
5  U33284  Use Restriction
6  H01F  No Extensions without Approval
7  U33288  Screen Fencing
8  F06F  Single Storey Buildings

INFORMATIVES

1  W38G  Informative: FRA
2  U33289  Informative: Plans
3  U33291  Informative: Reasons

For further information on this application please contact Fjola Stevens on 01243 534734
Southbourne

17. **SB/08/02060/DOM**

**Proposal**  New garage.

**Site**  Harbourside Prinsted Lane Prinsted Emsworth Hampshire PO10 8HS

**Map Ref**  (E) 476551 (N) 105092

**Applicant**  Mr Jack Moss

---

Note: Do not scale from map. For information only. Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Crown Copyright. License No. 100018803
History

06/05799/DOM  WDN  Single storey extension and 3 no. dormer windows to south elevation in connection with change of use of loft.
07/00940/PD  REC  Rooflights
07/03059/DOM  PER  Dormer windows in connection with loft conversion and single storey rear sunroom extension.
08/02060/DOM  PDE  New garage.

Constraints

Listed Building  NO
Conservation Area  NO
Rural Area  YES
AONB  YES
Strategic Gap  YES
Tree Preservation Order  NO
Proposed South Downs National Park  NO
Flood Zone 2  YES
Historic Parks and Gardens  NO

1.0 Reason for Committee Referral

Red Card - Cllr Marrs
Officer recommends Permit.

2.0 Representations and Consultations

2.1 Parish Council

Response awaited.

2.2 Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Response awaited.

2.3 Natural England

Response awaited.

2.4 4 Third Party Objections (1 has since been withdrawn and 1 objector wrote twice)

Site and location plan do not show recent extensions
Over-development
Creation of unacceptable density of substantial buildings in AONB
Overshadowing and reduction in light from west
Not sited in position of existing garage leading to large area of hardstanding
Loss of soft land adding to flood risk
Larger than the building it is replacing
Position next to wall contravenes legal and planning regulations

2.5 1 Third Party Other

Following clarification from application previous objection is withdrawn.

2.6 Applicants Supporting Information

A Design and Access statement has been submitted covering the issues listed below;

- Context
- Amount
- Layout
- Scale
- Landscaping
- Access

The document can be seen in full on the Council's website.

(Summary of letters dated 28th May 2008 and 2nd June 2008 to objectors)

Background AONB

Initially we thought of painting the doors a different colour to help fuse them into the backdrop and asked the Harbour Conservancy what colour they would like to see them painted. We then discussed with the HC the possibility of moving the garage back to improve the AONB so that it would not be as prominent from the foreshore and other vistas..... We asked for a pitched roof because a flat roof is difficult to maintain and a pitch can be more attractive. The pitch is the lowest possible for a pitch.... Harbourside's garage is not a very attractive flat roof building and it is located in a strange position because of the way it was split from Mayfield. It was Mayfield's garage initially.

Loss of soft ground

The garage is longer by about 6.6 feet so that a small workshop and garden storage can be achieved... Width of garage remains the same.

The increase to the length of the garage when added to the sun room extension represents around 10% of the overall footprint.

There will not be any loss of soft ground because the area behind the existing garage, where the new garage will be moved back to, has been hardstanding for 30 years and not currently an established garden area.

If the garage is allowed to be moved back improved planting along the west boundary, where the garage is now, will be possible as shown on the plans, this together with the increased lawn area at the front will create more soft area.

There will not be any extended hard driveway or increased hardstanding for parking. We are utilising the existing driveway by the front door for parking 2 cars and parking another car in front of the proposed new garage. The drive from the gateway to the terrace will be decreased to allow for extra lawn and thereby creating a bigger softer area, more planting and screening.
Over development

The increase to the footprint of the current bungalow and garage is only around 10%.

Legal requirements relating to boundary wall buildings

The new position of the garage will be able to be moved away from the joint wall and the boundary hedge, we believe this to be an improvement.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 The relevant policies from the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 are DEV1 (High Quality Development) and CH2 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).

3.2 The relevant policies from the Chichester District Local Plan, First Review 1999 are RE4 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), BE11 (New Development) and BE12 (Alterations, Extensions & Conversions).

3.3 The relevant strategy from the Council's Community Strategy 2006-2016 is:

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

4.0 Planning Comments

4.1 This site lies on the northern side of Prinsted Lane in an area designated as Rural Area by the Chichester District Local Plan 1999 and within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The property, which immediately fronts the water, is a red brick and rendered chalet bungalow with a steeply pitched tiled gabled roof, and a detached flat roofed red brick garage to the western boundary set slightly forward of the main property.

4.2 The proposal seeks to demolish the existing garage and construct a replacement garage further back into the site, set approximately 1m from the western boundary. The garage would measure 5.4m wide by 8.8m deep and have a shallow pitched roof, measuring 3.7m to the ridge, The garage would be constructed in brick with a tiled roof to match the main property and would be sited 5m behind the rear of the garage to be removed.

4.3 The main issues in this case are whether the proposal would result in development detrimental to the visual amenities of the area which is a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal seeks to replace an existing flat roofed structure sited forward of the main property and with white doors to the frontage which are prominent within the street scene. The replacement garage is proposed to be sited further back into the site and use materials to match the main dwelling, red brick and tiles. A condition is recommended requiring details of the finish of the garage doors in order that they be finished in a muted colour. It is considered that the garage would be viewed against the existing built development surrounding and, in a set back position approximately 35m from the highway would not result in development detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality or the character of the AONB.

4.4 With regard to impact on neighbour amenity the property to the west, Mayfield, has a large flat roofed double garage to its east elevation, sited between that property and the shared boundary with the application property. Mayfield has a flat roofed extension linking the garage to the main house incorporating a utility and sun room. There are no windows to the north elevation of the sunroom and due to the distances between the proposed garage and Mayfield it is considered the proposal would not
have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupier. The garage is set more than 20m from the boundary with the rear gardens of properties fronting Prinsted Lane to the east and would not have an impact on these properties or their amenity space due to this significant distance.

4.5 In respect of Human Rights, the rights of both the Applicant, the occupiers of neighbouring properties and of the wider community have been considered when reaching a decision to recommend that planning permission be granted. It is considered that for the reasons explained above that the recommendation is justified and proportionate in this case.

RECOMMENDATION

PERMIT

1  A01F  Time Limit - Full
2  B01F  No Departure from Plans
3  F02F  Materials to Match Existing
4  U34392 Staining
5  U34356 Demolition
6  H16F  Domestic Use Only

INFORMATIVES

1  U34357  Informative: Relevant Documents
2  U34391  Informative: Summ of Reasons for Per and Policies

For further information on this application please contact Natalie McKellar on 01243 534734
18. **SY/08/01492/DOM**

**Proposal**  
Change of use of domestic garage to a day room and store, including external alterations.

**Site**  
2 Northgate Cottages High Street Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0QG

**Map Ref**  
(E) 485320 (N) 93329

**Applicant**  
Mr Kevin Sumbler
History
03/02887/TCA NOTPO Notification of intention to reduce height down to 2.5m 4 no. Leyland Cypress trees and reduce height down to 5-6m 3 no. Leyland Cypress trees.
08/01492/DOM PDE Change of use of domestic garage to a day room and store, including external alterations.

Constraints
Listed Building NO
Conservation Area SELSEY
Rural Area NO
AONB NO
Strategic Gap NO
Tree Preservation Order NO
Proposed South Downs NO
National Park
Flood Zone 2 NO
Historic Parks and Gardens NO

1.0 Reason for Committee Referral
Parish Objection - Officer recommends Permit

2.0 Representations and Consultations
2.1 Town Council
The committee OBJECT to this application on the grounds that the proposed development is unneighbourly and out of character with the surrounding area. The proposed development would result in the loss of parking facilities. One Member wished it to be noted that he supported the application.

2.2 1 Third Party Objection
Harm to character of cottages
Overlooking
Loss of parking
Noise

2.3 2 Third Party Supports
Will improve character of building
Will enhance street scene

2.4 Agents Supporting Information
Cottages built in 19th Century in rural environment. Proposed development will enhance visual elevation from High Street, and includes much-needed structural, remedial and cosmetic work.
Existing space has been used for garaging but is now only used for domestic purposes. No addition proposed to shape, size or volume. Design seeks to harmonise with existing buildings by use of second-hand local stone, matching brickwork and keeping doors and windows in scale. Access not affected and amount of parking space remains the same. South elevation would remain unaltered except for window fitted with obscured glass. First floor roof space only (domestic storage).

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 Relevant policies in the Chichester District Local Plan include BE1 (Settlement Policy Areas), BE6 (Conservation Areas), BE11 (New development), BE12 (Alterations, extensions and conversions) and BE13 (Town cramming).

3.2 The aims of the Chichester Community Strategy documents are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, however, the document has not been examined in public and therefore only very limited weight can be given to its aims. The following aims are considered relevant to this application, they are as follows:

A.1 - Housing - Ensure the provision of housing to meet a range of local needs through a mix of housing types, sizes, and tenures.

A.2 - Housing - Help people to meet their own housing needs through information, support and advice.

A.4 - Housing - Create sustainable and diverse communities where good design makes attractive communities for people to choose to live and work.

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

3.3 The following government guidance in respect of this application is to be found in the following documents PPS and PPG15.

4.0 Planning Comments

4.1 1 and 2 Northgate Cottages comprise a pair of semi-detached 19th Century two-storey dwellings. They are situated at a right angle to High Street but set back 35m from the main road, so that they are only glimpsed from between the shops on the frontage. A private road leads between 102 and 104 High Street to an open yard adjoining 1 Northgate Cottages.

4.2 The proposal is to change the use of an existing garage to habitable accommodation. The main issues are whether the change of use would be out of character with the area, whether it would be unneighbourly and whether loss of parking would be harmful.

4.3 2 Northgate Cottages is the half of the building further from the High Street, but boundary arrangements mean that the building the subject of the application is attached to 1 Northgate Cottages to its eastern end, abutting the latter property's own garage. A parking and turning area serves both properties and is set behind the curtilages of shops on High Street. The proposal is unusual in that the proposed day room would be physically separated from no. 2, with access to it only externally.

4.4 The site lies within the Selsey Conservation Area but contributes only a limited amount to its character, being set back behind High Street properties. The present perception is of a utilitarian building consisting of three up-and-over garage doors with gabled roof above, and a flat roof over the third garage. The proposal would introduce windows and a door into the existing garage, introducing a
stone and brick front elevation. The proposed alterations would enhance the character of the conservation area. Negotiations have secured a traditional timber panelled door in place of a glazed door originally proposed, but the applicant is proposing PVCu replacement windows. On balance, your officers consider that these would not be significantly harmful, on the basis that the building is not listed and the overall character behind the High Street is that of ancillary storage buildings of no architectural merit set within rear service yards.

4.5 There is concern from the occupier of 1 Northgate Cottages that the use of the garage as habitable space would be unneighbourly. The garden/curtilage of no. 1 is limited in area, and there is an existing window in the garage of no. 2 facing that garden. The proposal is to retain the window but to fit it with obscured glazing. Whilst it appears that the window could be opened (it would do so over the boundary with no. 1) it would be prudent to allow the window to remain but to require it to be fixed and non-opening.

4.6 There is also concern that the loss of garaging space would lead to problems relating to parking. (The parking area is owned by the applicant, and the owner of 1 Northgate Cottages has a right of way over it.) In your officers' view, the yard would be of sufficient size to accommodate three vehicles and allow for access to the neighbour's garage and for turning a vehicle within the space.

4.7 In respect of the rights of the applicant and the occupiers of neighbouring properties to peaceful enjoyment of their homes, it is considered that the recommendation to permit subject to the conditions specified is justified and proportionate.

RECOMMENDATION
PERMIT

1. A01F     Time Limit - Full
2. U33548    Materials
3. U33550    Ancillary use only
4. U33551    No more windows
5. U33553    South window
6. U33555    Front door
7. U33563    Parking/turning

INFORMATIVES

1. U33564    Informative: Reasons
2. U33565    Informative: Plans

For further information on this application please contact Richard Dixon on 01243 534734
19. **SY/08/01833/FUL**

**Proposal**  
Change of use and alterations to 4 bedroom terrace house into 2 no. self contained flats.

**Site**  
24 Church Road Selsey Chichester West Sussex PO20 0LS

**Map Ref**  
(E) 485815 (N) 93625

**Applicant**  
Mrs Jackie Cook
History

05/01981/DOM PER Replacement rear conservatory.
08/01833/FUL PDE Change of use and alterations to 4 bedroom terrace house into 2 no. self contained flats.

Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONB</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Gap</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Preservation Order</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed South Downs</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Reason for Committee Referral

Parish Objection - Officer recommends Permit

2.0 Representations and Consultations

2.1 Town Council

The Committee object to this application on the grounds that the proposed development is unneighbourly intensification and will add to the parking difficulties in that part of the road.

2.2 Agents Supporting Information

No change to front of the building. Street scene not changed. Only changes to rear roof - wider dormer to provide more headroom. Only other changes - conservatory fenestration and minor alterations to side windows. Additional affordable dwelling to enable first-time buyers to take first step on housing ladder. Design provides good use of available space with space for 3 or 4 person families. No impact from overlooking, privacy or noise. Church Road is on major bus route - within 100m of bus stop. 22 Church Road already converted to 2 flats.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 Relevant policies in the Chichester District Local Plan are BE11 (New development) and BE12 (Alterations, extensions and conversions).

3.2 The aims of the Chichester Community Strategy documents are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, however, the document has not been examined in public and therefore only very limited weight can be given to its aims. The following aims are considered relevant to this application, they are as follows:

A.1 - Housing - Ensure the provision of housing to meet a range of local needs through a mix of housing types, sizes, and tenures.
A.2 - Housing - Help people to meet their own housing needs through information, support and advice.

A.4 - Housing - Create sustainable and diverse communities where good design makes attractive communities for people to choose to live and work.

A.6 - Housing - Improve the quality of the housing stock and home energy efficiency.

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

3.3 The following government guidance in respect of this application is to be found in the following documents PPS1 and PPS3.

4.0 **Planning Comments**

4.1 24 Church Road is a four-bedroomed Victorian terraced house situated on the western side of Church Road, Selsey. The area is predominantly residential but there are some non-conforming uses nearby (a church and builders' yard just to the northwest).

4.2 The proposal is to sub-divide the property into two self-contained flats. Each flat would have two bedrooms, flat 1 occupying the ground floor, flat 2 the first floor and the roof space. The main issues are whether the property is considered suitable in size and layout for use as two units, whether adjoining living conditions would be harmed and how the additional unit would have an impact on present parking provision.

4.3 The present house has four bedrooms, three on the first floor, and one in the existing roof space. In 2005 planning permission was granted for a conservatory at the rear of the dwelling, and this would be upgraded with a cavity wall and a reduction in glazing to form a lounge. The front of the house would be unchanged. A few minor changes would be made to ground floor windows to the rear, including an enlarged dormer in the roof to accommodate greater headroom to the stairs, and a window to a bathroom.

4.4 Your officers have some concern about the internal layout of the conservatory in terms of the indicative furniture layout, but the internal space could be better organised by creating a kitchen/dining area or making one of the bedrooms into a separate dining room. The organisation of the internal space is largely a matter for future occupiers, but the overall space standards are considered by your officers to be acceptable. Similarly, the flat on the first and second floors is considered to be satisfactory.

4.5 The property that would be most affected by the external changes to the building would be 26 Church Road. Currently this property is separated by a 2m wall at its rear, reducing to a 1m fence. Overall, the site elevation of no. 24 facing this neighbour would have fewer windows than at present. Nevertheless, it would be appropriate to impose a condition requiring a 2m high screen fence to be erected to protect the privacy of the garden area to the rear of 26 Church Road.

4.6 Both sides of Church Road are free of parking restrictions. No. 24 is one of a line of fourteen terraced houses, none of which have the benefit of off-street parking facilities. It is not considered that the addition of one dwelling unit would lead to significant harm to parking provision locally. It is acknowledged that the site is in a sustainable location on a bus route with a frequent service to Chichester. In any event, current parking standards are maximum standards, having an element of flexibility where appropriate.
4.7 Your officers have concluded that the subdivision of the house into two flats would not be harmful to the future occupants in terms of space standards, would not harm adjoining living conditions or the character of the area, or be contrary to the Council's parking standards.

4.8 No third party representations have been received.

4.9 In respect of the rights of the applicants and the occupiers of neighbouring properties to peaceful enjoyment of their homes, it is considered that the recommendation to permit subject to the conditions specified is justified and proportionate.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**PERMIT**

1. A01F  Time Limit - Full
2. U34083  Materials
3. U34082  Obscured glass
4. U34084  No more windows
5. U34085  Screen fencing

**INFORMATIVES**

1. U34086  Informative: Reasons
2. U34087  Informative: Plans

For further information on this application please contact Richard Dixon on 01243 534734
Proposal
Variation of condition no. 8 of planning approval WE/03/03270/FUL to reduce visibility splay.

Site
Aldsworth Manor Farm Aldsworth Westbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8QT

Applicant
Mr Andrew Elms
## History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97/00879/COU</td>
<td>WDN</td>
<td>Change of use to auction room and office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/02224/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Proposed new agricultural buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/02252/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Re-use of redundant farm buildings as five dwellings and associated works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03270/FUL</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>New agricultural buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01440/DOM</td>
<td>WDN</td>
<td>Erection of a log cabin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01037/FUL</td>
<td>PDE</td>
<td>Variation of condition no. 8 of planning approval WE/03/03270/FUL to reduce visibility splay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92/02030/CON</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>Enforcement Enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/00144/CONBC</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
<td>Enforcement Enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/00132/CONBC</td>
<td>PCO</td>
<td>Enforcement Enquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AONB</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Gap</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Preservation Order</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed South Downs</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 2</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1.0 Reason for Committee Referral

Parish Objection - Officer recommends Permit

## 2.0 Representations and Consultations

### 2.1 Parish Council

Westbourne Parish Council objects on the grounds of road safety. Aldsworth Common Road is a narrow rural road and condition 8 of planning approval WE/03/03270/FUL should remain without variation.

### 2.2 Sussex Downs Conservation Board

We have no objection to the application.

If your authority wishes to determine this application at variance with the Committee's views, the Committee would not wish to exercise its right to be heard under the Development Control Scheme.

### 2.3 WSCC - Highway and Transport Services

(7.4.08)

From an inspection of the plans above, there is no apparent visibility issue at the point of access onto Aldsworth Common Road. However, the applicant would need to provide the Highway Authority with more information on the proposed reduction in visibility.
Further to my comments dated 7th April 2008, I have received more information regarding visibility splays at the proposed site access. The splays provided would appear to be satisfactory. [2.4m by 150m]

2.4 Agents Supporting Information

Transport Statement

Aldsworth Common Road is a single carriageway road of rural character. The road is subject to the national speed limit for a rural single carriageway of 60mph. A speed and volumetric traffic survey was undertaken by West Sussex County Council in August 2007 to establish vehicle speeds past the access and from this derive sight lines appropriate to the use of the access.

Data collected by WSCC in August 2007 indicates about 400 vehicles a day using Aldsworth Common Road (two way) with a 85 percentile speed of about 40 miles an hour. [The 85th percentile speed is recognised by traffic engineers as the optimum level at which to set speed limits. When speed limits are set in accordance with the 85th percentile, it means that the majority of drivers are travelling within the law.]

From this can be derived a distance of 75-80m measured along the kerb edge from the centre of the access. This sight line will be sufficient to enable vehicles travelling up to the legal speed limit of 60 mph to stop safely in the event of an emergency.

At present there is good visibility from 2m behind kerb. Maintenance and trimming of boundary hedges could increase this to 3m.

3.0 Planning Policy

3.1 Relevant policies in the West Sussex Structure Plan include LOC2 (The countryside), NE13 (Transport), DEV1 (High quality development) and DEV4 (Safe access to the highway network). Relevant policies in the Chichester District Local Plan include RE1 (Rural development) and TR6 (Highway safety).

3.2 The aims of the Chichester Community Strategy documents are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, however, the document has not been examined in public and therefore only very limited weight can be given to its aims. The following aims are considered relevant to this application, they are as follows:

A.5 - Housing - Create pleasant, safe, clean and green places to live.

B.2 - Transport - Ensure that our roads are safe for everyone.

B.4 - Ensure that the transport network improves the efficiency of local businesses, and that the impact of goods vehicles in sensitive areas is minimised.

F.8 - The Environment - Protect and enhance local character and the quality of the built and natural environment.

G.1 - The Economy - Support business in creating a strong and diverse economy that is appropriate to the nature of the District.
3.3 The following government guidance in respect of this application is to be found in the following document PPS1 and PPS3.

4.0 Planning Comments

4.1 In March 2004, planning permission was granted for two agricultural buildings off Aldsworth Common Road (WE/03/03270/FUL). One of the conditions imposed (No. 8) imposed the following requirements:

"The access hereby permitted shall be laid out to provide visibility splays on each side of the access in accordance with the plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the District Planning Authority.

These splays shall be:

2m by 2.4m on each side of the proposed access based on the existing highway boundary, together with sight lines defined by:

(a) A line 4.5m long measured along the centre line of the proposed access from the line of the nearer edge of the carriageway of Aldsworth Common Road;

(b) Line 215m long on each side of the access measured along the nearer edge of the carriageway of Aldsworth Common Road from their intersection with the centre line of the proposed access;

(c) The straight lines joining the termination of the above lines.

Reason: In the interests of road safety."

4.2 The purpose of the application is to seek a reduction in the visibility splays/sight lines necessary to allow safe access to, and egress from, the site. Following consultations with WSCC Highways, the applicant has confirmed that the proposal is for splays of 2.4m (measured back from the edge of the carriageway) by 160m (measured along the road to the point 2.4m from the edge of the carriageway).

4.3 A transport statement was submitted with the application (see paragraph 2.3). The volume and speed of traffic was such that a reduction in the length of the visibility splays (approved at 4.5m by 215m) could be considered, for reduction. The Parish Council, however, should be adhered to in the interests of road safety and have objected to the proposed reduction.

4.4 WSCC Highways are of the opinion that there is no apparent visibility issue at the access. Following further discussion, the County has accepted splays of 2.4m by 160m. Plans showing these splays (and confirmation that both lines can be accommodated within the existing grass verge without impinging on the roadside hedge) were requested and this additional information confirms that the existing hedge would be unaffected.

4.5 The main issue in determining this application is whether the reduction in the length of the visibility splays would be harmful to the safety of road-users in Aldsworth Common Road. The County Council has confirmed that it has no objection to the reduced splay and accordingly your officers consider that planning permission should be granted.
RECOMMENDATION
PERMIT

1 A01F  Time Limit - Full
2 U33117  Splays

INFORMATIVES

1 U33120  Informative: Existing permission
2 U33123  Informative: Reasons
3 U33125  Informative: Plans

For further information on this application please contact Richard Dixon on 01243 534734