

11 December 2012 – At a meeting of the Committee held at County Hall, Chichester.

Present:

Mr Whittington (Chairman), Mr Blampied, Mr Coomber, Mr Doyle, Mr R B Dunn, Mrs Mills, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Quirk, Mr Rogers, and Mr Waight.

Apologies:

Mrs Coleman and Mr Hellawell.

Mr B Hall was absent.

Declarations of Interest

54. There were no declarations of interest.

Minutes

55. Resolved – that the minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2012 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

County Matter Application

56. WSCC/007/12/WE Proposed restoration of Hambrook Marl Pit and agricultural improvement scheme using imported inert materials and on-site derived materials at Hambrook Marl Pit, Marlpit Lane, nr Hambrook, Chichester, West Sussex, PO18 8UL.

57. The Committee received a report from the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). Sam Dumbrell, Senior Planner, introduced the report and advised the Committee of the key issues relating to the application.

58. Mrs B Young spoke in opposition to the application. Mrs Young was concerned about the substantial impact the noise, dust and light associated with the quarry restoration would have on both her residence and her business. Mrs Young was sceptical that the works would be completed in the expected two years, particularly if materials were being screened and removed. She was concerned that it could become a screening plant. Her property was on a higher level than the kennels so the visual impact would be greater. Mrs Young suggested that works only be carried out five days a week rather than the planned five and a half to give residents a whole weekend that was free of noise. Mrs Young was also concerned about the crystalline silica dust that could be created from the concrete that would end up all over her property because of the prevailing winds.

59. Miss A Crooks, the Planning Agent, spoke in support of the application. The only materials that would be removed from the site would be unwanted and not for processing. The soil would be screened to be the appropriate grade for the agricultural area. The applicant had worked positively with County Planning Officers and there had been no objections from statutory consultees. The current planning

permission contained no requirement to improve the northern part of the site. The current application would have a positive impact on the local economy.

60. Mr T.M.E. Dunn, the local member also spoke on the application. Residents in the immediate vicinity of the site had never been particularly pleased to live near the site, particularly whilst anti-social activities were happening there. Residents were resigned to these works taking place as long as sufficient conditions were in place to improve unsightly land. For example, Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) needed to be restricted to the stated route and this needed to be policed vigorously as routes through the surrounding villages had unsuitably narrow roads. Mr Dunn stressed the importance of enforcing the conditions stringently.

47. The Committee raised those points below in the discussion that followed:

- The soil screener would be noisy and create dust but it would be located at least 40m away from property boundaries and would move northwards as the works progressed. This satisfied the Environmental Health Officer from Chichester District Council.
- The applicant would need to apply for an Environment Agency (EA) permit should the permission be granted and this would require a full audit trail from the inert materials source to ensure that it was suitable. Both the County Council and the EA would carry out inspections to ensure conditions were being adhered to.
- The operational hours and split of the land between 70% agriculture and 30% flora and fauna had satisfied the County Council's ecologist.
- The HGV route would be controlled by the Section 106 agreement and was legally enforceable if HGVs deviated from the specified route.
- The County Council was now being more proactive about enforcement and the planning conditions would be enforced via chargeable visits (maximum of 8 per year).
- The numbers of vehicles associated with the development was capped at a maximum of 40 HGV movements (20 in and 20 out) per day at peak times. There was some concern that 'peak times' could occur for the two years it would take to complete the development and some members felt that an average number would be better but accepted that this would not be possible to calculate at the meeting as the applicant needed to be consulted.

61. Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to:

- (a) the conditions and informatives set out in appendix 1 of the report;
- (b) the completion of a Section 59 Agreement to cover the increase in extraordinary traffic that would result from construction vehicles and to enable the recovery of costs of any potential damage that may result to the public highway; and
- (c) the completion of a Section 106 Agreement controlling HGV routing, works in the public highway, warning signage, and allowing diversion of Public Footpath 255.

Update on Mineral, Waste and Regulation 3 Planning Applications

62. The Committee received and noted a report by the County Planning Manager on applications awaiting determination (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes).

Report of Delegated Action

63. The Committee received and noted a report by the County Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) advising of the uses of delegated powers to grant permission for development proposals under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 since the Planning Committee meeting on 13 November 2012.

Date of next meeting

64. The next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 15 January 2013 and the next site visits would take place on Thursday 10 January 2013.

The meeting ended at 12.10 p.m.

Chairman