

For questions regarding this agenda please ask for Chris Punnett - email: chris@conservancy.co.uk

14th December 2011

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY - PLANNING COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Conservancy's Planning Committee will be held at **11.15am** on **Monday 19th December 2011** at **County Hall, Chichester**.

Siún Cranny
Director

AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. Declaration of Interest

Members and officers are invited to make declarations of personal or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on the agenda and are reminded to make declarations at any stage during the meeting if it then becomes apparent that this may be required when a particular item or issue is considered.

3. Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 21st November 2011 (page 3).

4. Urgent Matters

Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency due to special circumstances (if members have any urgent matters they are asked to consult the Clerk before the meeting).

5. Development Control Applications

To consider one planning application upon which the Conservancy has been consulted, which members have been notified of previously, and to agree a recommendation to the appropriate local planning authority (page 11).

6. Changes to Planning Guidelines

To consider a report by Conservancy officers (page 15).

7. Development Control - Delegated Action

To note action taken by the Director, with the agreement of the Chairman, in submitting observations on planning applications upon which the Conservancy has been consulted by the local planning authorities, comments on which were required before the date of this meeting (page 33).

8. Appeal Decisions

To note five Appeal decisions issued by the Planning Inspectorate (pages 37, 40, 42, 45 and 48 respectively).

9. Reports Back for Information – January to March 2011

To consider a report by Conservancy officers (page 51).

Date of Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Committee will be held at **11.15am on Monday the 23rd January 2012**, at County Hall, Chichester.

Committee Members

Chichester DC: Mr Graeme Barrett, Mr David Myers; Deputy: Mr John Connor
Hampshire CC: Mr Tim Knight (ex officio as Chairman of the Conservancy), Mr Frank Pearce, Mr Alan Rice (Vice-Chairman); Deputies: Mrs Ann Buckley and Dr Ray Ellis
Havant BC: Jackie Branson, Mr John Smith
West Sussex CC: Mr Bill Acraman, Mr Lionel Barnard, Mr Pieter Montyn (ex officio as Vice-Chairman of the Conservancy); Deputy: Mrs Louise Goldsmith
AC Cons' Members: Mr Nick Fox, Mr Steven Schrier (Chairman); Deputy: Mr Peter Taylor
Local residents: Mr Keith Martin
Farming/landowning: Mr Simon Sprackling
Environmental: Mr Steve Gilbert
Additional two reps: Mr Michael Glanville, Mr Peter Henshaw

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at County Hall, Chichester on 21st November 2011.

Present:

Mr Steven Schrier (Chairman)

Mr Lionel Barnard

Jackie Branson

Mr John Connor*

Mr Peter Henshaw

Mr Tim Knight

Mr Keith Martin

Mr Pieter Montyn

Mr Frank Pearce

Mr Alan Rice

Mr John Smith

Mr Peter Taylor*

*Mr Connor deputised for Mr David Myers; *Mr Taylor deputised for Mr Nick Fox.

Officers: Linda Park (Planning Officer) and Chris Punnett (Administrative Officer)

APOLOGIES

412. Apologies were received from Mr Nick Fox, Mr Steve Gilbert, Mr Michael Glanville and Mr David Myers.

MINUTES

413. **Resolved** that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24th October 2011 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS

414. The Committee considered a report detailing the recommendations of the Manager & Harbour Master to the local planning authorities on Development Control applications, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes. The Planning Officer presented the applications utilising a PowerPoint presentation to identify and describe the applications and sites.

BI/11/03981/FUL: Wophams Lane Nursery, Wophams Lane, Birdham, Chichester, West Sussex PO20 7BS - erection of ground mounted solar photovoltaic panels

415. The Committee considered the information contained in the report, as detailed below:

"Wophams Lane Nursery is located on the east side of Birdham Road, opposite Chichester Marina. It lies just outside but close to the AONB (the boundary of which runs along the Birdham Road) and within the rural area, and comprises several horticultural glasshouses and 'The Barnyard' farm shop and garden centre, including 'Blue Ribbon plants'.

"Permission was refused in 2010 for the replacement of 2 existing glasshouses within the eastern part of the site and the erection of a new glasshouse within the southwestern part of the site, adjacent to the main road and AONB boundary. The Conservancy objected due to the landscape impact of a building of this size in such close proximity to the AONB, and the Council's reasons for refusal supported this view.

"The current application seeks permission for the installation of ground mounted solar photovoltaic panel arrays in 3 locations. Location A would be set back from the road to the south and east of the existing glasshouses; and locations B and C would be sited in the fields directly adjacent to the road, to the north and west of existing buildings (set back a minimum of 48 metres from the road). The panels would be set at an angle of 35 degrees with a maximum height of 1.8m and each of the 3 arrays would measure a total of 60 metres long and 27 metres wide. Details of the panels, including silver frames and patterns have been included in the application. The application lacks information regarding the management of the site, for example, whether the ground areas would be grazed or mown and whether the remainder of the field would continue to be used for 'pick your own' fruit and vegetables.

"Location A would be sited beyond the largest existing glasshouses as viewed from the AONB and would therefore not be visible from the west. Locations B and C would be significantly closer to the AONB, although from most perspectives would be well screened by the existing mature hedgerow of mixed native species which runs along the north and west boundaries of the field (alongside the roads). There are views through to locations B and C from the Birdham Road to the southwest opposite the farm shop due to the lower height of the roadside hedge, and therefore we would suggest that additional planting could be provided on the southern boundary of the field to help screen the panels from this perspective. We would also ask for suitable conditions to ensure that there is no security lighting or fencing installed which would be detrimental to the rural character of the area or cause significant light pollution, and that any proposed hardsurfacing is limited and of appropriate materials."

416. Members considered that as well as seeking planting on the southern edge of the field in which locations B and C were situated, to prevent the panels being visible from the south, a condition requiring retention of the existing hedges on the north and west of the site should also be sought to ensure that the site remained obscured from view from the AONB. Members also considered that a condition should be sought requiring removal of the panels when they came to the end of their useful life, whenever that might be.
417. **Resolved** that Chichester District Council be advised that the Conservancy proposes no objection but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible: -
- New hedge to be planted on the southern boundary of the field to screen the panels from view from the southwest;
 - Suitable conditions be included in any permission granted to apply appropriate controls over any security lighting, fencing or hardsurfacing.
 - Retention of the existing hedges on the north and west of the site to ensure that the site remains obscured when viewed from the AONB.
 - Removal of the panels when they come to the end of their useful life, whenever that might be.

APP/11/01536: 68 King Street, Emsworth, PO10 7AZ - refurbishment of existing dwelling to include: new fenestration layout on main house, the rebuilding of the existing conservatory with solar panels on the roof, a new larger garage with pitched roof, new screen wall between house and garage and new external and rooding materials on house and garage

418. The Committee considered the information contained in the report, as detailed below:

"68 King Street is a 1960s dwelling located on its own projecting quay on the eastern end of the Emsworth Harbour frontage, just north of Emsworth Yacht Harbour, and west of the Slipper Mill Pond. It lies within the AONB and the Emsworth Conservation Area. The site is unusual in that all four sides of the building are clearly visible from public viewpoints including from the wider landscape - there are clear views of the west and south elevations from the head of the Emsworth channel, 'the promenade' public footpath to the west, and the footpaths at Emsworth Yacht Harbour; and clear views of the east and north elevations from the footpaths around the Slipper Mill Pond to the east. The existing building is somewhat incongruous due to its use of yellow brickwork and its modern design proportions in comparison with the majority of buildings along the main Emsworth Harbour frontage, which are of more traditional design in red brick with tiled roofs. It comprises a two-storey pitched roof element with a projecting flat roofed sunroom, and a single-storey matching pitched roof element, as well as a flat roofed double garage in the northeast corner of the plot.

"Two applications have were submitted in summer 2010; one for the refurbishment and extension of the existing dwelling (APP/10/00350 refers); and the other for its demolition and wholesale replacement (APP/10/00455 refers), with a new 5-bedroom house. Both applications would lead to the same resulting building. Conservancy officers had been presented conceptual plans of a proposed new building prior to the applications, and had commented that any increase in bulk would need to be carefully assessed and invited plans showing a comparative outline of existing and proposed elevations, so that the increase in size could be properly assessed. We also made comments encouraging the use of techniques to minimise the impact of glazing, such as deep eaves overhang, louvres, vertical subdivision of windows and the use of muted or dark coloured frames if large areas of windows are proposed. Finally, we discouraged the proposed use of light blue weatherboarding as suggested and commented that any material and finish should reflect or compliment the surrounding traditional brick buildings.

"The submitted plans with the 2010 applications showed a contemporary dual mono-pitched roof design for the main two-storey part of the dwelling, with a wrap-around glazed balcony element, attached to a large single-storey element with a multi-pitched roof incorporating a living room, bedroom with ensuite, sauna, 12.5m long swimming pool, a gym, garage and store. This element would extend fully to the north boundary of the site (where the existing flat roofed garage would be demolished), and would include a row of high level glass panels on a vertical wall facing west. The Conservancy raised serious concerns about the overall design and bulk of the proposed dwelling, which had dramatically changed since the pre-application scheme, and it was clear that there would be a substantial increase in bulk as well as footprint with the proposed new building. Of further concern was the design and extent of glazing. The Conservancy concluded that the overall impression from the many exposed public viewpoints would be of a large, contemporary building incorporating large areas of glazing, its scale, bulk and design contributing to its impression of being beyond domestic in appearance, and invited the applicant to reconsider the design to address the concerns raised with regard to bulk, glazing and materials.

"The application was withdrawn and a revised scheme (APP/10/00926) introduced a more contemporary, striking roof design with an inverted dual mono-pitch on the two main elevations rising towards the edges. The Conservancy felt that these changes would further increase the prominence of the building in wider views, in particular the more striking roof design and increased glazing at first floor level; and therefore moved even further away from what was considered potentially acceptable in such an exposed location within the AONB. The application was subsequently approved by the Borough Council.

"A further application (APP/11/01064) showed a return to a more traditional roof shape of 'dark patinated zinc with a matt finish'. The Conservancy felt the more traditional roof form and other improvements to the design would substantially reduce the perceived bulk and intrusiveness of the building in comparison with the very strikingly 'contemporary' design of the approved scheme. However, we were unsure about how the zinc roof would fit into the historic waterfront and also felt that the extent and proportions of glazing on the west and south elevations remained unsympathetic and therefore we maintained an objection on this basis. The application was approved by the Borough Council.

"This latest application proposes to refurbish the existing dwelling with new external materials of subdued natural stone render, retaining the existing concrete tiled roof, with new windows of grey aluminium and solid oak external doors. The existing conservatory would be re-built with solar panels added to the roof; and the existing garage would be replaced with a larger pitched roof building (containing a triple garage and annex accommodation), but would remain much lower than the main building.

"Overall the current scheme would have significantly less impact on the AONB given that the changes involve modest refurbishment of the existing elevation materials, a replacement conservatory with solar panels (which would appear from the plans to be hidden from view by a parapet roof) and a 'brise soleil' to shade upper parts of the glazing; replacement windows and a new garage of limited height which would not be intrusive in views from the surrounding footpaths or the harbour. Our only specific comments would include that materials and external finishes should be agreed by condition, to include soffits and fascia boards, window frames and the colour of the proposed render to ensure that it takes the opportunity of improving the building's appearance in the historic waterfrontage. We would also ask that the existing planting on the site is retained and enhanced, and that details of the proposed solar panels are agreed to ensure that they are not visible from public viewpoints. We would also prefer to see vertical subdivision in the conservatory and for the windows on the south, east and west elevations to break up their proportions and reduce reflectivity."

419. Members noted the Planning Officers' advice that this latest application was in line with the views which the Conservancy had consistently expressed regarding this sensitive site, and as such was to be welcomed as it was visible from all view points. Members did however express concern that there was no detail on the treatment of the photo-voltaic panels proposed or the roof of the conservatory, and expressed the hope that they would not be visible from the wider landscape.
420. **Resolved** that Havant Borough Council be advised that the Conservancy proposes no objection but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:
- Samples of materials to be agreed by condition, to include window frames, soffits and fascia boards, and render colour;
 - Retention and enhancement of existing planting on the site;
 - Details of solar panels to be agreed to ensure that these are out of sight from public viewpoints; and
 - Conservatory windows and square windows on the south, east and west elevations to be given vertical subdivisions.

BO/11/04547/DOM: Field End, Shore Road, Bosham, Chichester, West Sussex. PO18 8QL - the installation of 18no. photovoltaic panels on the south west roofslope of the property

421. The Committee considered the information contained in the report, as detailed below:

"Field End' is a modern detached dwelling located on the southern side of School Rythe and Shore Road. It is a rectangular shaped building with a shallow pitched roof covered in grey tiles, with a gable fronting onto the harbour and a balcony underneath overhanging eaves.

"A certificate of lawfulness application was submitted recently (BO/11/03577/PLD) for the installation of 18 photovoltaic solar panels on the southwest roofslope of the property, and this was refused due to the fact that 'Permitted Development' (PD) rights had been removed by the original permission in 2003. The Conservancy acknowledged that we had no particular remit in its determination as the application was to be determined on facts of planning law alone; however, we did flag our concerns regarding the potential visibility of the solar panels given the exposed harbourside position of the property and therefore we encouraged the applicant to consider anti-glare panels with black borders in order to limit their visual impacts.

"The current application seeks planning permission for the 18 photovoltaic solar panels on the southwest roofslope. The panels would be positioned on the rear portion of this roofslope, occupying just under half of its area. 'Sharp' manufacturers details have been included which show a typical panel with silver borders and a silver lattice pattern on a black panel.

"Conservancy officers have viewed the site from the water in the Bosham channel and the School Rythe inlet and note the visibility of the building for significant distances to the west and northwest. However, given the contemporary design of the dwelling, the shallow nature and grey colouring of the existing roof, and the proposed positioning of the panels on the rear portion of the roofslope where they would be less clearly visible (partly due to the presence of a mature tree alongside the building); it is felt that the panels would be unlikely to be unduly intrusive in the landscape. The panels would be unlikely to be visible from the historic core of Bosham on the north side of the inlet due to the orientation of the roof. However, given the views from the water to the west and northwest, we would still encourage the use of panels with black borders (we understand that these are available) as this would significantly reduce any visual intrusion and help the panels to blend better with the existing roof. We would also ask for the southwest boundary tree to be retained as this helps to screen parts of the roof in views from the west."

422. Members agreed with the Planning Officer that it was essential to minimise the visibility of the proposed panels, and suggested that matt black panels would achieve this better than any other style/colour combination. The importance of the tree in mitigating the impact of the panels was also recognised, and it was suggested that it should be protected and that any severe pollarding be discouraged.
423. **Resolved** that Chichester District Council be advised that the Conservancy proposes no objection but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible: -
- Applicant considers using panels with matt black borders;
 - Retention and protection of the southwest boundary tree to prevent its being lopped or pollarded.

SB/11/04339/DOM: Prinsted House, Prinsted Lane, Prinsted, Emsworth, Hampshire, PO10 8HS - 16 no. pv solar panels to rear garden

424. Mr Martin declared a personal interest in this matter on the grounds that he was acquainted with the applicant.

425. The Committee considered the information contained in the report, as detailed below:

“These were the Conservancy's comments on a previous application for ground-mounted solar PV panels at this property (SB/11/03041/DOM refers):-

“Prinsted House is a large detached dwelling located to the south of Prinsted in an isolated rural position, adjacent to Thornham Marina. It has a large garden to the south and east of the house, which meets the foreshore footpath on its southeast corner. The boundaries of the garden are marked by planting, including a mature hedgerow on the boundary with Thornham Lane to the west which provides an effective screen. There are views through the gaps in the more sparse boundary planting on the northeast boundary from the water and foreshore footpath to the north and east.

The application seeks permission for a free-standing solar pv panel in the southwest corner of the garden. The structure would comprise a row of 4 panels totalling 6.69 metres long, 1.29 metres high and 0.88 metres deep. The panels would be slanted at a 30 degree angle facing due south.

There are likely to be glimpsed views of the proposed structure from the foreshore footpath and water to the north and east, and therefore we would ask for a suitable planting scheme to provide new shrub planting directly to the north, to help to break up the outline of the structure and/or screen it from view from these perspectives. We would also ask that the planting on the north-east boundary of the garden be supplemented to fill in the gaps and therefore reduce the views through towards the proposed structure, given the exposed position of the site adjacent to the foreshore and harbour. Propose no objection but ask that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-

- *New shrub planting to the north of the proposed structure;*
- *Supplementary planting on the northeast boundary to infill the existing gaps”.*

“The application was approved, although the Council felt that a condition for additional screen planting would not be reasonable due to the amount of existing established planting and the distance of the panels from public viewpoints.

“The current application seeks permission for 4 rows of the panels, rather than 1 row as granted under the recent permission, set further north into the garden but with the provision of new Birch tree planting along the north and east sides of the panels. The location of the panels and the proposed additional planting should ensure that they are not intrusive features in the landscape, and therefore we would not wish to raise an objection provided a suitable condition is included to ensure that the new planting is provided. We would however comment that Birch is not a native species typical of the AONB and we would prefer to see native species considered as an alternative.”

426. Members did not object to the enlarged area of panels now proposed, provided these were suitably screened from view. An additional condition was suggested to agreed details of any hardsurfacing, given the rural location on the edge of the harbour.

427. **Resolved** that Chichester District Council be advised that the Conservancy proposes no objection but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-

- New planting to be provided in the first available planting season and to be native species typical of the AONB.
- Details of any hardsurfacing be agreed.

SB/11/04317/FUL: Glebe Farm, Main Road, Southbourne - erection of agricultural barn (amended design to that permitted under SB/11/02573/PNO and SB/10/05521/PNO).

428. The Committee considered the information contained in the report, as detailed below:

"Glebe Farm has recently been split from Weston Fruit Farm and includes apple orchards located on the south side of Main Road, in the rural area west of Nutbourne. A prior notification application was permitted for an agricultural barn for a machinery store, cold store and farm office (11/02573/PNO refers). Planning permission was also granted for an access track leading from Main Road southwards and westwards to the proposed barn (11/00606/FUL refers), to which the Conservancy did not object. The current application seeks planning permission for a slightly amended siting and an amended design for the agricultural barn. The supporting statement states that the holding of 15 acres needs to have a barn to house machinery, tools and have a cool room and packhouse for the apples and other fruit, along with a small farm office and washroom in order to comply with Health and Safety requirements.

"The barn would be sited further from the field boundary trees than the permitted barn to ensure the retention of these trees, in the southwest corner of the field, to the south of Main Road. The barn would be 12.2m x 6.2m with a pitched roof rising to 7.3m high. It would be clad in untreated oak with a brick plinth and a cedar shingle roof. The permitted access track and hardstanding would be surfaced in crushed sandstone.

"This is a well screened site where views of the site are limited to those from Main Road. The proposed barn may be glimpsed through gaps in the trees during the winter months but it would not appear unduly intrusive given the level of screening, design and proposed natural materials. We would therefore not wish to raise an objection, provided that the District Council is satisfied of the agricultural need for this building. We would however ask for suitable conditions to agree a schedule/samples of materials and finishes for the building, and also for the access track/hardstanding and any proposed gate onto Main Road which should be appropriate to the rural character of the site. We would also ask for a suitable condition to ensure the retention of all boundary trees/planting, and controls on any external lighting, which should be limited given the rural location of the site."

429. The Committee considered that the necessity for the building would be tested by the local planning authority, but wished to be assured that the building would remain for agricultural purposes and no other purpose.

430. **Resolved** that Chichester District Council be advised that the Conservancy proposes no objection but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible: -

- Schedule/samples of materials to be agreed prior to construction, including building, access track/hardstanding and any proposed entrance gate onto Main Road;
- Retention and management of boundary planting;
- Suitable controls on any external lighting.
- Restriction on use of the building and office for agricultural purposes only.

PROPOSALS TO EXPAND AND REVIEW THE CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY PLANNING GUIDELINES

431. The Committee considered a report on the Conservancy's planning guidelines, as contained within appendix 3 of the AONB Management Plan and attached to the report as Annex 1 (copy attached to the signed minutes).

432. The Planning Officer advised that the planning guidelines have not been formally 'adopted' by the Local Planning Authorities as the main body of the AONB Management Plan has, but rather their purpose is to guide the Conservancy's Members and officers when assessing planning applications or changes to planning policies at all levels.
433. The review of the AONB Management in 2013/14 would be the normal opportunity to review the Planning Guidelines but there are important issues which have arisen since the last review that now require relevant amendments to be made. It is therefore proposed to carry out an urgent review of the planning guidelines as a whole, with a view to streamlining or improving existing policies as well as adding new ones, and a timetable for their review over the course of the next three planning committees had been prepared.
434. The Committee noted the report.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - DELEGATED ACTION

435. The Committee considered a report on action taken under delegated powers, with the agreement of the Chairman and following consultation with the Planning Committee Sub-Group, in making recommendations on behalf of the Conservancy on planning applications to Havant Borough and Chichester District Councils, a copy of which is attached to the signed minutes.
436. **Resolved** that the action taken under delegated powers be noted.

APPEAL DECISIONS: APP/L3815/C/11/2151289 AND 2151294; GRANARY WEST, WESTLANDS FARM, WESTLANDS LANE, BIRDHAM PO20 7HH AND APP/L3815/C/11/2151235 AND 2151242, GRANARY EAST, WESTLANDS FARM, WESTLANDS LANE, BIRDHAM PO20 7HH

437. The Committee noted the Inspector's decision to dismiss these appeals against CDC enforcement notices and refusal to allow use of the dwellings for residential purposes, and agreed that the view taken by the Inspector should guide the Conservancy in future applications of a similar nature.

APPEAL DECISION: APPEAL REF: APP/L3815/H/11/2157279, LEWIS SAAB, RONIC HOUSE, MAIN ROAD, BOSHAM PO18 8PN

438. The Committee noted the Inspector's decision to dismiss the part of this appeal relating to a free-standing double-sided illuminated pylon sign, which the Conservancy had not objected to, and agreed that the view taken by the Inspector should guide the Conservancy in future applications of a similar nature.

The meeting started at 11.15am and ended at 12.20pm.

Chairman

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Committee will commence at **11.15am** on **Monday the 19th December 2011**, at County Hall, Chichester.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY**PLANNING COMMITTEE****19th DECEMBER 2011****REPORT BY CONSERVANCY OFFICERS****DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS****BI/11/04680/FUL: MOORINGS, WESTLANDS ESTATE, BIRDHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7HJ****REPLACEMENT HOUSE, GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING.****PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

PPS 7 paragraph 21; RE1, RE4, BE14, H12, C1: Adopted Chichester District Local Plan 1999. Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2004-2009: BD1: Appendix 3: Policies B2, B3. Chichester Harbour AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions.

CONSERVANCY OFFICERS' COMMENTS

'Moorings' is a detached, two-storey house fronting the Harbour at the Westlands private estate in Birdham. The property has an unusual design with two 'Dutch barn' gable faces fronting the Harbour. The house is painted white including the gable faces, with dark tiles to the roof. The second, smaller gable-face onto the Harbour appears as a detached annex although is linked to the main house at ground floor level. There is also a detached flat roofed garage and workshop building alongside this. The house is visible from an angle from the foreshore footpath running past this row of properties, and is clearly visible from the main Harbour channel, in a treed setting which forms a backdrop particularly from the northwest, due to the line of mature trees running along the northeast side boundary and meeting the foreshore. The existing garage and workshop building is hardly visible from the Harbour due to its low form and dark materials.

Permission was sought in Spring 2010 (BI/10/01871/DOM refers) for a first floor in-fill extension and two-storey extension to the northeast side of the existing annex. Materials included grey/brown weatherboarding to the existing white-painted gable faces. The Conservancy acknowledged that this would reduce their visual prominence in wider views and therefore this approach is to be encouraged; however, we considered that for the amount of accommodation gained by the proposals, the increase in the developed frontage of the property onto the Harbour, and its perceived bulk and massing from this perspective would be excessive. We invited the applicant to consider amending the scheme by repositioning the extensions, to address the Conservancy's concerns. The application was withdrawn, and amended plans were submitted to Conservancy officers which showed a significantly reduced silhouette on the proposed rear (Harbour-facing) elevation, with part of the extensions relocated to the southern side of the building. We welcomed the changes which we felt addressed the concerns previously raised.

A later application was submitted (BI/10/05158/FUL) for a completely new scheme for a wholesale replacement dwelling with a slightly lower overall height than the existing building, comprising two main hipped elements facing the Harbour with an interconnecting roof between, and further connecting 'wings' including a single-storey hipped roof element on either side of this elevation. The dwelling would have been 32 metres wide (almost 10 metres wider than the existing house not including the detached garage) across the width of the plot, with the main bulk being shifted further east (extending almost to the eastern boundary). The Conservancy objected to this application due to the excessive plot coverage onto the waterfront and increased dominance of the building. The proposal also brought the new building significantly closer to the foreshore footpath and water (including a projecting two-storey element) and this exacerbated the increased overall impact. Further compounding this was the proposed design, including rows of continuous glazed panels on the Harbour-side and the west elevation, and a very shallow pitched roof, giving an unbalanced appearance. The application was subsequently withdrawn.

Conservancy officers had two meetings with the applicants and their agents to discuss detailed suggestions to overcome our concerns. This included an 'L-shaped footprint' which would have far less impact on the wider landscape by reducing the overall built frontage onto the Harbour, a significant reduction in the amount of glazing and revisions to its design, a deeper roof with lower eaves to break up the mass of the building and provide a more balanced north elevation, and a building which extends no further towards the Harbour than the existing building. A single-storey projecting element was subsequently accepted in principle given the proposed demolition of the sauna and shed buildings, subject to appropriate design and materials.

This application is a resubmission based on the pre-application discussions and suggestions. The building has been significantly re-designed and moved so that the main two-storey bulk is in the approximate position of the existing house, rather than shifted further towards the eastern boundary. The projecting element has also been reduced from two-storey to single-storey with a pitched roof with overhanging eaves to shade vertically subdivided glass panels serving the breakfast room. Various other changes have also been made to the overall design, including simpler lines and a deeper roof (remaining no higher than the existing building), a reduction in the amount of glazing and changes to the design of windows with most incorporating glazing bars; the introduction of a verandah/canopy feature across the harbour-elevation; and single-storey side elements now limited to one side only (in the same position as the existing flat roofed garage), with a low pitched roof and a flat roofed link element. The scheme would still include a detached double garage and store with a low hipped roof within the frontage onto Westlands.

Materials for the main dwelling would be a mixture of brick and timber cladding on the elevations, with elements of colour-washed render on the single-storey element and on the south (non-harbour) elevation, with a natural slate roof (including the verandah and single-storey elements). The statement mentions including 'discrete provision for solar collectors' into the design, however, these are not shown on the plans. The application includes comparative footprint and silhouette diagrams which show that the increases would be within the recommended maximums set out in the AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions, with the main change in the harbour-facing silhouette being an effective 'infil' of the gap between the existing main house and annex element. The west elevation (the next most visible from the wider landscape) has been significantly reduced in bulk from the previous application.

Overall we are pleased to say that the various suggestions and comments made during pre-application discussions have generally been taken on board, and the current scheme represents a substantial improvement over the previous application. The overall proportions of the building are much improved from the previous scheme, and the proposal would incorporate several positive design features which would help to provide interest and articulation into the elevations, such as the verandah elements and eaves overhang to the main roofs. These elements would also help to throw shadow onto areas where there is a greater amount of glazing, although overall the extent of glazing has been significantly reduced, and is now considered to be proportionate to the building, as advised in the AONB Design Guidelines. The single-storey element would not significantly increase the perceived width of the building due to its low roof and the 'visual break' provided by the flat roofed link. Overall, it is not considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would be unduly intrusive in the landscape, provided the final detailing, materials and landscaping are sympathetic and appropriate for this exposed, rural position on the edge of the harbour.

We note that 'existing and replacement trees' are referred to in the supporting statement but no detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted - we would ask that a suitable condition is included on any permission granted to ensure the retention of the existing trees on the site and to encourage additional planting where possible. We would also ask that a condition is included to require that samples of materials are agreed prior to construction, and detailing to include balcony balustrades, window frames and fascias/soffits etc, and any 'solar collectors' as referred to in the statement (these should be positioned so that they are out of sight from the wider landscape).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Propose no objection but ask that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-

- Samples of materials be agreed prior to construction including elevation and roof materials, balcony balustrades, window frames and fascias/soffits etc;
- Details and siting of any 'solar collectors' be agreed prior to construction;
- Detailed landscaping scheme to be agreed, to include retention of all trees on the site and additional planting where possible.

The Moorings, Westlands Estate



0 20 40 80 Meters



RGB Aerial Photography- © GeoPerspectives
Reproduced from or based upon 2008 Ordnance Survey material with permission of the Controller of HMSO (c) Crown Copyright reserved.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings
West Sussex County Council Licence No. 100023447

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY**PLANNING COMMITTEE****19th DECEMBER 2011****REPORT BY CONSERVANCY OFFICERS****FIRST STAGE OF THE REVIEW OF THE CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY PLANNING GUIDELINES (APPENDIX 3 OF THE AONB MANAGEMENT PLAN): DECEMBER 2011****1. Introduction**

The Conservancy's planning guidelines are contained within appendix 3 of the AONB Management Plan. The planning guidelines have not been formally 'adopted' by the Local Planning Authorities as the main body of the AONB Management Plan has, but rather their purpose is to guide the Conservancy's Members and officers when assessing planning applications or changes to planning policies at all levels. The guidelines interpret the national and local planning policy framework as it applies to Chichester Harbour AONB.

- 1.1 In responding to planning applications, the Conservancy has a more limited remit than the Local Planning Authorities. We primarily comment on visual impacts to ensure that all development conserves, and wherever possible, enhances the landscape of the AONB and protects its setting. We also seek to ensure that development complies with the protective framework for sites designated for nature conservation, and that the socio-economic activities supporting the AONB and its communities are taken into account in the planning process. As such, the Conservancy will not normally comment in detail on other matters (such as highway safety, flood risk, archaeology, historic buildings, residential amenity etc) but will defer these issues to the Local Planning Authorities and their expert advisers (which include the Highway Authority, the Environment Agency, Natural England, the County Archaeologist, the Historic Buildings Officer, the Agricultural Advisor etc).
- 1.2 As set out in the report to the 21st November 2011 planning committee, as a result of the fact that there are a number of key existing policies which need reviewing in addition to gaps within the guidelines where relevant issues are not covered, it is proposed to carry out a review of the planning guidelines as a whole, with a view to streamlining or improving existing policies as well as adding new ones. This would help to ensure that there is sufficient coverage of the key planning issues that the Conservancy regularly deals with, as well as ensuring that the policies are as effective as possible at informing the consideration of those planning issues. There will be an opportunity to fully review the revised policies during the next AONB Management Plan review in 2013/14. Once all completed, a copy of the revised policies will be sent to all Members and also to the Local Planning Authorities.
- 1.3 Upon commencing the review it has become evident that a greater amount of updating is required across all the policies and therefore a revised timetable is required. This will be distributed at the meeting.

1.4 A copy of the existing planning guidelines is attached at appendix 1, and the proposed revised policies are set out below.

1.5 Proposed revised policies

Policy A6: Telecommunication masts

The Conservancy is likely to object to telecommunication masts within and adjacent to the AONB unless the application:

- **Provides details of the need for the mast or masts in the proposed location;**
- **Provides evidence that other, less sensitive locations or co-location have been fully considered;**
- **Considers the height, colour and design of the mast to reduce visual impact; and**
- **Provides details of natural, or appropriate other, screening.**

Telecommunication masts can have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape of the AONB, whether they are located within or adjacent to the boundary. Applicants are encouraged to consider reducing the impacts of these often intrusive vertical features in the landscape.

Policy A7: Horse and pony grazing

The Conservancy is unlikely to object to horse-related development that does not have a detrimental impact on the AONB landscape and nature conservation interests. Proposals should:

- **Locate new buildings in existing groups of buildings or in less exposed positions where visual impact is minimised;**
- **Be a structure necessary for grazing of horses or ponies, be of a simple design using appropriate materials and have a low ridge height;**
- **Include details of any appropriate screening using native tree and shrub species typical to the AONB.**

The use of agricultural land for horse and pony grazing can change the character of the AONB and erode its rural qualities. This is particularly true where paddocks are poorly managed, fields are subdivided with inappropriate fencing and horse shelters are prolific, poorly constructed and maintained. These together with other paraphernalia such as jumps and horse equipment stored outside of the buildings can have a detrimental impact, particularly in exposed locations. The Conservancy is likely to seek a temporary permission only for any buildings; a restriction on the outside storage of equipment, and the use of post and rail fencing rather than plastic.

Policy B5: Beneficial disposal of dredging materials

The Conservancy will require the disposal of dredging materials derived from within the Harbour to be in accordance with the Beneficial Disposal Study, wherever possible.

The Conservancy recognises the need for maintenance dredging to be carried out within the Harbour to enable marine-related businesses to continue to use their facilities to their designed depths. In addition, the Conservancy has a duty to maintain and improve navigational facilities within the Harbour. However, we also recognise that the intertidal mudland is an irreplaceable conservation resource and that any dredging application should be fully justified and, wherever possible, sediments not lost to the Harbour intertidal habitat.

Therefore, wherever reasonable dredge arisings should be disposed of within the Harbour at the Treloar Hole, to allow their redistribution over the intertidal habitats. Wherever practicable dive surveys should be carried out at the disposal site before and after sediment placement. However, the Conservancy acknowledges that due to the nature of the sediments and the capacity of the Treloar Hole, in certain circumstances alternative disposal methods may be more appropriate.

Policy B5a: Renewable energy: micro-generation for householders

The Conservancy in principle supports the installation of domestic-scale solar technologies, small-scale wind turbines, heat exchange systems and other renewable energy technologies, provided there is no detrimental impact on the AONB or its setting. Applications should:

- **Take opportunities to site discreetly or out of view from public vantage points;**
- **Be designed as far as practicable to minimise their impact on the appearance of the property; and**
- **Be of an appropriate scale in relation to the property and its setting in the wider landscape.**

The need for formal planning consent varies depending upon the type, size and location of the renewable energy installation proposed. Many installations also benefit from permitted development rights, although all domestic wind turbines within the AONB will require planning consent. Potential applicants are referred to the Conservancy's Renewable Energy Guidelines for advice on the permissions required, information on key considerations for installation and examples of best practice. Any applications should accord with the advice contained within the Guidelines.

Policy B5b: Renewable energy: medium-scale

The Conservancy is likely to raise an objection to medium-scale renewable energy installations within and adjacent to the AONB, unless they are sited in a suitable location where visual impacts would be limited and appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts are identified, so that there is no detrimental impact on the AONB or its setting.

As the scale of the technology increases, so does the potential for greater visual impact. Potential applicants are referred to the Conservancy's Renewable Energy Guidelines for

advice on reducing visual and other impacts. Any applications should accord with the advice contained within the Guidelines. In certain circumstances, the long-term impacts of the technologies may be capable of being mitigated and applicants would be required to provide further details.

Policy B5c: Renewable energy: large-scale

The Conservancy is likely to raise an objection to large-scale renewable energy installations within and adjacent to the AONB due to their detrimental impacts on the landscape and conflict with the purposes of the AONB designation.

Given the scale of the technologies, it is likely that there will be a detrimental impact on the landscape of the AONB and its setting in the coastal plain and therefore a conflict with the purposes of the AONB designation. With respect to wind turbines, this impact can be experienced over considerable distances. In addition, large wind turbines or a large installation of turbines is likely to have impacts upon nature conservation interests. Given the scale of these technologies it is unlikely that their wider impacts could be successfully mitigated.

Policy K1: Recreation and tourism: public access

The Conservancy is not likely to raise an objection to maintenance, enhancement and improvements to the public access network or the provision of appropriate visitor information and structures where they are consistent with Chichester Harbour AONB's landscape and nature conservation designations.

The Conservancy supports the maintenance, enhancement and improvement of the public access network within and adjacent to the AONB. Schemes such as public or permissive footpath enhancements to increase accessibility are likely to be supported, so too the provision of additional cycle access or the creation of new bridleways. However, a careful balance needs to be struck between providing access and the long-term impacts on the nature conservation interests through increased recreational disturbance.

2 Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee approves the revised policies detailed above.

APPENDIX 1

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Guidelines for Chichester Harbour AONB

Purpose of the Planning Guidelines

The purpose of the Conservancy's Planning Guidelines is to guide its members and officers when assessing planning applications or changes to planning policies at all levels. These guidelines interpret the national, regional and local planning policy framework as it applies to Chichester Harbour AONB. The planning policy context, within which the Planning Guidelines sit are given in a Policy Framework in each section of the Guidelines.

The Planning Aims of the Conservancy

- (i) To protect, conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chichester Harbour AONB.
- (ii) To protect, conserve and enhance the value of the area for wildlife.
- (iii) To conserve, maintain and improve the Harbour, and its associated facilities and marine industries, for water-based recreation, where they are consistent with (i) and (ii).
- (iv) To support sustainable forms of industry and agricultural practice where they are consistent with aims (i), (ii) and (iii).
- (v) To support the economic and social needs of the local communities where they are consistent with aims (i), (ii) and (iii).

1.0 Agriculture and Landscape

POLICY A1. The Conservancy will seek to retain the rural nature of the area, opposing applications which involve major changes in geomorphology or which introduce large numbers of people into the landscape. In particular the Conservancy will oppose any applications that have an irreversibly damaging effect on the rural and natural nature of the landscape.

Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are designated for the conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and to preserve their unique characteristics. Policies and development control decisions made by partner authorities that affect Chichester Harbour AONB should favour the conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape, as well as the economic and social well being of the area.

POLICY A2. Whilst it is recognised that some agricultural development is permitted development, the Conservancy will seek to minimise the impact on the landscape of agricultural structures, that are out of keeping with the landscape, through the principle of prior notification. If the Conservancy is aware of any threats from permitted development, it will urge the local planning authorities to seek an Article 4 direction for significant landscape or environmental areas, where it is apparent that this landscape or environmental value is threatened by unacceptable land use.

Almost all the area of the AONB is high-grade agricultural land. As such the pressures for alternative land use in times of over-production have been considerably less than would have been the case had there been large areas of low-grade land. The General Permitted Development Order 1995 sets out the requirement of prior notification to local planning authorities by a farmer exercising their permitted development rights for agricultural purposes. This means that the Conservancy is also notified of a proposed additional agricultural building within the AONB and has the opportunity to suggest changes or raise concerns.

POLICY A3. The Conservancy will support only those proposals for a change of use from agriculture to other appropriate uses that can be accommodated without harming the open countryside or special landscape characteristics of that particular locality. Chichester Harbour AONB is outside of the areas designated for horticulture in the adopted local plans. Any application for a change of use to horticulture will need to demonstrate the need for horticulture in that location, the impact of the buildings on the landscape, and the increase of light and noise pollution.

Farming is currently facing economic problems and this is encouraging farmers to diversify. This has included a change to horticulture within the area. Horticulture is still defined in the Use Classes Order as an agricultural use and therefore is not seen as a change of use in the legislation. The AONB is seeing a substantial increase in the demand for horticulture and has concerns over the intrusiveness of such buildings within the landscape. Glass itself is a reflective material and is very visible from long distance views or within the immediate landscape setting. This is particularly the case when sited close to waterfront locations. Due to the loss of wooded shoreline and an increase in the openness in the landscape, there are very few locations within the AONB that can accommodate horticulture without a detrimental impact on the landscape.

POLICY A4. The Conservancy will only support the conversion of agricultural buildings to an alternative use if The Design and Access Statement submitted with the application outlines the following:

- **A business or tourism use is considered for the building before residential;**
- **The design is sympathetic to its landscape context particularly the use of materials, the insertion of additional openings and prevents any urbanisation of the site, particularly if a residential curtilage is to be introduced;**
- **Where a conversion is for a self-catering use or holiday home a holiday occupancy condition should be instated as part of the planning permission;**
- **Where residential is considered to be the best use, the statement should be submitted explaining why the site is unsuitable for employment or a tourism use, and if the site is suitable as an exception site (as defined in PPS 3) and could be considered for affordable housing;**
- **That protected species are not affected, such as bats and barn owls.**

With regard to the alternative uses of agricultural buildings, the Conservancy supports sustainable forms of economic development and recognises that agriculture and local industries must be able to adapt and evolve in response to changing circumstances. However, the landscape and environmental qualities of the AONB are a primary concern and therefore any applications for conversion of redundant agricultural buildings will be scrutinised for their landscape and conservation implications and their impact on the vicinity.

POLICY A5. The Conservancy will seek to ensure that any proposed development for the diversification of farming, the conversion of existing redundant buildings, a new industrial or employment site, or a tourist or sports facility will not:

- **Cause a detrimental impact on the landscape by creating excess artificial light;**
- **Cause a detrimental impact on the tranquility of the AONB by the level of noise generated;**
- **Be visually intrusive.**

The pressure for diversification in farming together with the ubiquitous nature of industry means that Chichester Harbour AONB has locations that are attractive to industrial development. This type of development can be intrusive in the landscape and create light or noise pollution. Part of the reason for designating Chichester Harbour as an AONB is to retain its tranquility and landscape character. The AONB Landscape Character Assessment

(2005) has identified areas where tranquility should be protected and sensitive areas where the cumulative effect of lighting will be damaging.

POLICY A6. The Conservancy will only support telecommunications masts where:

- **A Design and Access Statement shows that there is a genuine need for the mast in that location within the AONB and no other suitable site or mast sharing opportunities are available outside of it;**
- **That the mast is sited in an appropriate location within trees, or within an existing redundant structure/building;**
- **That the mast is sensitively designed, its colour, height and bulk is kept to a minimum and that opportunities to disguise the mast are made (for example it could be made to look like other vertical key features in that landscape, for example trees or telegraph poles).**

The Conservancy is now receiving further pressure for the erection of telecommunications masts within or adjacent to the AONB boundary. Any applications for these intrusive features need to be considered with care.

POLICY A7. The Conservancy will only accept horse related development within the AONB that minimizes its impact on the wider landscape, does not have a detrimental visual impact by being located together with other similar developments, which are not of poor quality and not harmful to any sensitive sites for nature conservation. Any horse related development should:

- **Locate new buildings in existing groups of buildings on a site;**
- **Be a structure necessary for grazing of horses and a simple horse shelter should still be of good design, using appropriate local materials of a dark palette and low ridge height.**
- **Locate the structure against planting or another built backdrop to minimize its impact.**
- **Apply conditions to ensure the inside storage of jumps and horse equipment; to encourage planting of native species typical of Chichester Harbour AONB or post and rail fencing to any field boundaries.**

The use of agricultural land for horse grazing is changing the character of the AONB and eroding its rural qualities, particularly where paddocks are poorly managed and fields subdivided with inappropriate fencing, and horse shelters of poor quality are constructed. This together with other paraphernalia such as jumps and horse equipment stored outside of the buildings has a detrimental impact on the character of the landscape, particularly in exposed locations. Where planning permission for horse related buildings is required then conditions to secure improvements in land management for horse use for that particular site can be pursued. In addition any new structure should be of appropriate scale, local materials and positioned in a location in the field where it has a minimal impact on the wider AONB landscape.

POLICY A8 –The Conservancy will seek to ensure that historic environment issues are addressed in the Local Development Frameworks and also given due consideration in planning applications. Where a site of archaeological importance is identified, the Conservancy will liaise with the relevant local authority archaeology officer and advise the local planning authority on its records of the site and whether development is likely to be harmful to identified archaeology.

Historic landscape features, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings and archaeological sites are all-important components of the Chichester Harbour AONB

landscape and contribute to its overall character. The Conservancy holds details of the Chichester District, Hampshire County and West Sussex County Historic Environment Records which provide describe sites of archaeological interest within the AONB.

Agriculture and Landscape : Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPS 7 Countryside paragraphs 15-21,30,32,40, Annex A, Annex E, E30-E35; PPG 8 Telecommunications paragraphs 3,20, 24-28,Appendix: paragraphs 7, 64,66-69; PPS 3 paragraph 30. PPG16: paragraph 12. Annex B: paragraphs 15-18.

South East Plan Submission Draft: C2.

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016: CH2, CH3, CH4, CH5, CH6, CH7.

Adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 2001-2016: C1, C5, E6, E8.

Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 2005: C1, L1, R6, PC4,

Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999: RE1, RE4, RE6,RE12, RE14, RE29, C1, BE3.

2.0 Built development - Land based

POLICY B1. In principle, the Conservancy will support only those proposals for new residential development which are in existing defined settlement boundaries as shown on the proposals maps in the adopted Local Development Plans, or are expressly intended to meet the social and economic needs of the rural communities and which do not adversely affect the landscape or conservation qualities of the AONB. Any applications for infilling within hamlets or villages outside of the identified built up areas will be resisted where it would result in harm to the character of the area by reducing plot size, intensifying development, and would result in unsustainable development.

The AONB is designated for its special landscape qualities. In Chichester Harbour planning policies and development control decisions should take full account of the special qualities that justify the designation of the AONB and sustain or further its purposes. The Conservancy's Landscape Character Assessment defines landscape types and landscape character areas providing guidance for proposed development. The Landscape Character Assessment defines key features and elements of each landscape character area and how new development will fit its context.

To this end the Conservancy continues to support prioritising development in Urban or Settlement Policy Areas as defined in the adopted development plans. Whilst it is understood that the planning authorities have approved infill or replacement dwellings outside of these areas, the Conservancy will not normally support residential development outside of defined settlements boundaries, unless it can be clearly demonstrated in a design statement that the infill development or replacement dwelling will not cause a detrimental impact on the wider AONB landscape. Sometimes there is a genuine socio-economic need for a rural exception site for housing, in accordance with the local housing needs survey. The Conservancy would support the principle of exception sites.

POLICY B2. The Conservancy will oppose any property extension or replacement dwelling which significantly increases the size of the property to the detriment of the landscape and that increases the developed frontage of the waterside, when seen from public vantage points, such as public footpaths, the water.

The Conservancy's report on small-scale incremental changes shows that most damage to the AONB comes from the cumulative impact of small developments within a concentrated area. The AONB's attractiveness and landscape quality fuel the demand for significantly extending homes, or creating much larger, grander replacement dwellings within the AONB

in ways that are out of keeping with the landscape, particularly in waterside locations. The Conservancy will continue to resist development that is detrimental to the landscape.

POLICY B3. The design construction and alteration of buildings in the AONB should reflect the nature of the landscape and the natural environment by linking the built environment through the use of vernacular styles and materials and good design. Special consideration will be given to such applications in respect of listed buildings. Chichester Harbour Conservancy in conjunction with two local planning authorities have produced Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions which should be referred to when assessing or presenting new proposals.

Proposals for new development should enhance the local distinctiveness of the AONB. Features that are locally distinctive of the built environment of Chichester Harbour include:

- Settlement patterns
- The siting of its buildings and the distance between them
- The materials used
- Its landscape setting and topography
- The proximity to sites of archaeological importance or to the setting of listed buildings, open spaces and trees.

POLICY B4. Applications for further signage in Chichester Harbour AONB and on its boundary will be resisted in areas where clustering of signage is already identified as being harmful to the rural character of the AONB. Business premises which already have signage, will be asked to consider advertising collectively by having one single coordinated sign for their advertising. This signage should be an appropriate colour, scale and lettering and for be located in one position on the site. The illumination of signage is not appropriate to the character of the AONB and all signage should be kept to the minimum size possible.

Chichester Harbour AONB is a Special Area of Advertisement Control and proposals for new signage to properties/business should be located and designed to ensure minimal impact on the AONB landscape. Further signage should be avoided on premises where a clustering of signage at the site or in the immediate vicinity is already eroding the quality of the area. The Conservancy in conjunction with its partners hope to produce Design Guidance on new non-highway signs to promote appropriate scaled signs and identify areas where clustering is already an issue and harmful to the AONB landscape, this can be on the border to the AONB as well as within the AONB.

POLICY B5. Micro-generation for householders: The installation of solar panels, domestic wind turbines, heat pumps either individually or in conjunction with other installations should be appropriate to the scale of the property, its setting and should have a minimal impact on the wider AONB landscape, in particular:

- a. Wind turbines either on buildings or stand alone should be positioned so as to minimise views of them from public vantage points in the wider AONB landscape, i.e. from the water or public footpaths; should be a dark colour and not white; and not require the removal of existing planting/trees at the site.
- b. Solar panels should be positioned on a roof slope of a dwelling or ancillary building facing away from public vantage points, match the roof colour or be integral to the roof and be of minimum scale required.

- c. Ground source heat pumps should be sited so they do not cause disturbance to designated sites for nature conservation and have minimal noise emissions to maintain the tranquility of the AONB
- d. Air source heat pumps should be sited behind buildings and out of view from public vantage points; be small in scale and have minimal noise emissions to maintain the tranquility of the AONB.

POLICY B6. Large-scale renewable energy sources are unlikely to be appropriate within Chichester Harbour AONB or close to its boundary because of the visual intrusion in the exposed Coastal Plain landscape and disturbance to designated sites for nature conservation, which make up its character. Policy EN5 of the South East Plan Submission Draft confirms that within protected landscapes renewable energy development should be of small-scale or community based and that those proposals within or close to designated areas should not undermine the purposes of designation either for landscape or nature conservation. The Conservancy would wish to see these principles of EN5 reflected in Local Development Framework policy including areas outside of the AONB but visible from within it. (For example Wind Turbines on the Downs could still have significant visual impact on Chichester Harbour AONB as well as South Downs AONB.)

In its response to the consultation for Permitted Development Rights for Householder Micro-generation (small scale forms of renewable energy for individual households) the government confirms that there will be no greater restrictions on permitted development rights for these types of development for National Parks or AONBs. This means there will be permitted development rights available to householders for solar, wind, heat pumps, combined heat and power, biomass and the restrictions applied in protected landscapes will be the same as undesignated areas. The Conservancy, in conjunction with its partners intends to produce Design Guidance on microgeneration to try to address some of these issues. The policy above hopes to provide those seeking to install microgeneration technology with suggested locations and materials that would be more appropriate to the character of Chichester Harbour AONB.

POLICY B7. Natural England is the statutory consultee responsible for advising on whether an Appropriate Assessment is required under the Habitats Regulations. Local Planning Authorities are responsible for undertaking a screening opinion to establish whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required for Schedule 2 or 3 developments within the AONB. The Conservancy will normally be consulted in these situations and will assess the potential impacts based on its own data and guidance such as the Biodiversity Action Plan and Landscape Character Assessment (2005) and will seek to ensure there will be no harm to the designated sites for nature conservation.

POLICY B8. The presence of protected species on a site is a material consideration in planning terms. The extent of protected species and how they may be affected by any proposed development should be assessed prior to development being permitted and appropriate conditions suggested through survey if these would make the development acceptable. Areas around existing designated sites can also be part of an overall habitat network as defined in PPS 9 paragraph 12. Where development affects these areas and the integrity of a designated site the Conservancy is likely to raise an objection to the proposals.

The impact of development within the AONB on designated sites for nature conservation is a key issue and the Conservancy seeks to ensure that no harm to designated sites occurs through the development process. Designated sites are an important part of the Harbour's ecology and character and the legislation contained in the Habitat Regulations (1994), the EIA Regulations, the Crow Act (2000) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), all provide a stringent legislative framework to ensure this avoided unless its in the overriding national interest. The Conservancy

will comment on all planning proposals that affect wildlife and will seek to inform the process based on its own data and survey work.

Built development - Land based: Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPS 1 paragraph 17; PPS 7 paragraph 21, and paragraphs 3.19 –3.21; PPS 3 paragraph 30, 68-69;

South East Plan Submission Draft: C2, EN1, EN5, NRM4, NRM5, NRM6

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 deposit draft: CH2, DEV1

Adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 2001-2016: H9, H10, C1,C2, E6, E7

Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan: C1,D1, L1, ENG1, D4, NC1-NC5.

Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999: RE1, RE2, RE3, RE4, RE12, RE14, C1, BE9

3.0 Infrastructure and Integrated Access

POLICY C1. To improve integrated access within the AONB, the Conservancy will expect appropriate new development to make contributions to improving local public transport services and cycling or walking opportunities within the AONB as identified in the Local Transport Plans. Major employment and tourism uses will be expected to produce Green Travel plans to show how workers and visitors will be using alternative methods of travel.

The accessibility issues around parts of the AONB are mainly in the peninsula locations of Hayling Island and the Manhood. The improvement of the infrastructure and accessibility in these areas will be supported in principle. .

The Hampshire and West Sussex Local Transport Plans do encourage greater use of public transport, walking and cycling, both for visitors and local people. The Conservancy and its partners are promoting several initiatives including a new cycle network and the provision of a rambler bus, as well as improving facilities for horse-riders. In addition, the Conservancy will work together with its partners to provide more integrated access links and information for the AONB. This will include leaflets showing train times, bus times around the AONB and links for pedestrians and cyclists from main public transport nodes.

The diversification of farming and conversion of redundant agricultural buildings can often be for employment or tourism uses that make an important contribution to the economic vitality of the AONB. Where such uses are compatible with the landscape the Conservancy will look for the submission of Green Travel Plans and some funding towards routes and links for the AONB.

POLICY C2. The Conservancy will seek early consultation with the appropriate highway and planning authorities on any new road proposals within or adjacent to the AONB.

Although alternative methods of transport to the car are being promoted in Local Transport Plans, there is still pressure for new roads within or just outside the AONB that will affect the rural quality and tranquility of the area.

POLICY C3. The Conservancy will support small, screened and well-sited, car parks and some extension of the existing car parking areas where these are significant to the needs of the AONB.

The Conservancy is aware of the demand for additional parking in the area. Being mindful that car parks can be an attraction to visitors, the siting and screening of these should be very carefully considered. The Conservancy will look to reduce parking pressure in small village environments.

Transport and Integrated Access : Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPG 13, paragraphs 40 – 44

South East Plan Submission Draft: C2.

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016: NE12, NE13, NE14.

Adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 1996-2011: T1, T2, T4, T8, T12

Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan: T5, T6, T8.

Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999: RE4, TR8, TR9

4.0 Built Development – Commercial

POLICY DI. To protect existing waterside sites for marine uses and water related facilities any new development or redevelopment of boatyard and marina sites will only be permitted for uses associated with boat building, repair, maintenance and ancillary uses. Where a site has been vacant for a long period of time and it can be demonstrated through marketing for at least a year that a marine facility is no longer viable, a mixed use retaining some marine use and alternative employment uses will be considered provided that can be accommodated without harming the special qualities of the area and which are capable of reversion to marine industrial use at a later stage.

The Conservancy and its partners view a change of use of any existing Harbour boatyards to residential development with concern. In the interest of maintaining the health of the local economy, the Conservancy and its partners will support suitably appropriate alternative commercial uses where these can be accommodated, without harming the essential qualities of the area.

POLICY D2. All applications for a change of use will be considered alongside the need to maintain the landscape and nature conservation interest of the AONB. Any applications for conversion of redundant agricultural buildings to industry will be scrutinised for their landscape and conservation implications and their impact on the vicinity.

POLICY D3. Extension of existing employment units on existing industrial parks or estates within or on the boundary of the AONB need to ensure that the scale of the extension, it's proposed materials are designed to minimise the visual impact of the building. Where an existing building is visually intrusive, any application that seeks an extension to it should ensure some remodelling of the building to improve its appearance and its amenity within the AONB. Existing planting to the site boundaries should be retained and further planting of native species typical of Chichester Harbour AONB should be undertaken to ensure the rural character of the area is maintained.

It is contrary to the purposes of the AONB designation to allow major industrial or commercial development in Chichester Harbour AONB. In Chichester Harbour it should be assessed whether the proposed commercial development is necessary to sustain the rural economy and this should be balanced with the need to protect the countryside. In addition, any new commercial uses should be accessible by a variety of transport modes, unless the development would only create modest traffic movements.

In this context the Conservancy is concerned that industrial development should be confined to existing sites and suitable activities where these have established rights. With regard to the conversion of such sites, the Conservancy recognises that the main impetus for such a change arises from the difficulty in maintaining the financial viability of boatyards in the face of increased land development values. However, the Conservancy is also aware that a policy, which resisted any change of use, could lead to a derelict site and the loss of employment. Therefore the Conservancy is sympathetic to applications for alternative industrial uses where these do not harm the AONB and where reversion to marine industrial use is possible.

There are existing industrial estates on the edge of the AONB and also smaller rural employment sites within the AONB. Any application to extend or alter these buildings in these locations will be assessed on its visual impact on the AONB and the need for that extension will need to be described in any supporting statement to ensure the new extension is of an appropriate, scale and form to its landscape setting.

Built Development - Commercial : Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPG 4, 1992: paragraph 13

PPS 7: paragraphs: 5, 19, 20, 22.

South East Plan Submission Draft: C2, NRM8,

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016: CH1, CH2, DEV1, DEV2, DEV3, DEV4

Adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan Review 1996-2011: EC1, EC3, EC4

Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 2005: EMP 7, EMP9, C1, L1.

Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999: RE4, RE14, RE15, C1, C7, B2, B3, B4, B5

5.0 Jetties and Slipways, Navigational Facilities and Sea Defences

POLICY E1. In considering proposals for development of jetties and slipways the Conservancy will take ecological, landscape and safety of navigation considerations into account with a presumption against development in those areas identified as being un-spoilt by existing structures, where the landscape and conservation value is high and the area is most congested by vessels.

POLICY E2. Development which creates the need to modify, relocate or redistribute the number of moorings, marina berths or launch-on demand facilities will only be allowed if there is no detrimental impact on safety of navigation, sailing, the designated sites for Nature Conservation and landscape.

The Harbour is designated as internationally important for nature conservation. It also carries national and local designations for nature conservation. The 1994 Habitats Regulations requires Natural England to assess whether the proposed development will have a significant adverse impact on the features and species of interest within the European site. If Natural England decide it will be damaging then the developer will be required to undertake an Appropriate Assessment.

Following an Appropriate Assessment the local planning authority and Natural England can determine whether the development is acceptable and if so what conditions may be necessary.

POLICY E6. Proposed sea defence works must not be damaging to nature conservation interests and environmental impacts must be properly assessed.

POLICY E7. If shown to be necessary, the sea defence must be well engineered and capable of withstanding with the forces acting on the sea defence. Any impacts on nature conservation interests should be mitigated.

POLICY E8. The sea defence works should be as sympathetic to the landscape as possible and the materials and style chosen must be carefully considered in each location and not selected purely by cost. The Conservancy's recommended form of replacement sea defence is rip-rap style revetment. This method of construction helps to reduce erosion by absorbing the impact of the waves; it also enables vegetation to grow over it in time making it more natural part of the landscape.

POLICY E9. Sea defence works should not have an adverse impact on navigation.

Chichester Harbour's shoreline is continuously eroding as it has always done as part of the natural coastal process. The whole area is slowly sinking due to geological movements in the South East area. With the onset of global warming and sea level rise, the inter-tidal mudland is being squeezed between rising sea levels and coastal defences. This leads to a significant reduction in the area of mudflats and salt marshes that support plants, invertebrates and birds. Because of the European and national nature conservation designations in the Harbour, Relevant Statutory Authorities have to take reasonable steps consistent with their functions to further the conservation and enhancement of Sites of Special Scientific Interest and to not undertake or give permission for any works that adversely affect the integrity of the European site.

When considering applications for new sea defences several factors should be considered:

- Movement of material along the coastline
- The effects on economic activity
- The introduction of managed retreat in low-lying coastal areas.
- Cumulative effects.
- Navigation.

Local planning authorities in conjunction with partner organisations have a responsibility for improving and enhancing the coast in areas of natural beauty and high conservation value and to restore stretches of the despoiled coastline.

As a consequence of global warming, the threat of increased flood risk means that Harbour side landowners are increasingly seeking to defend their boundaries. Farmers of low-lying areas also wish to carry out works and improvements to their sea defences. Where sea defence works are sought it is likely that an Appropriate Assessment will be required.

Jetties and Slipways, Navigational Facilities and Sea Defences : Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPS 9: paragraphs 6-12 and 15 and 16. Circular 06/2005: paragraphs 9-20, 99,118-124, Statutory Instrument 1999 No.293, Town and Country Planning EIA Regulations 1999. PPG 20,1991:4.5 and 4.6;

South East Plan Submission Draft: C2, NRM4, NRM5, NRM6
Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016: CH1, CH2, CH5, ERA2, ERA3
Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1994: R1 (iii), R8, R9, NC1-NC5
Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999: RE4, C1, C2, C3, C4, C9, C10

6.0 Formal Recreation and Tourism

POLICY J1. The Conservancy will oppose any facility, which will provide new public access to the water for vessels or will increase the number of vessels using the harbour.

POLICY J2. The Conservancy will continue to maintain a moratorium on additional deepwater moorings.

POLICY J3. The Conservancy will oppose any proposals for new marinas at heads of channels.

POLICY J4. The Conservancy will support the provision of additional facilities for visiting yachts and the improvement of existing recreational facilities where these are consistent with the planning aims (i) and (ii).

POLICY J5. The Conservancy will support the replacement of existing moorings with marina berths.

Whilst recreation is not an objective of AONBs, the demand for recreation can be met as long as it is consistent with maintaining its natural beauty. All estuary plans have to manage the rapid growth of the demand for marinas, boat moorings, parking, and dry berthing and launching.

For some time, the Conservancy has recognised that water-based recreation in the Harbour has reached a point of congestion at peak periods, which can be dangerous and detracts from the value of recreation. The Conservancy will oppose any further proposals for marinas at or near the heads of channels. It has a moratorium on further deepwater moorings and will recommend refusal of any applications, which permit additional public access to the water for vessels, in order to keep this crowding to a minimum. However, the Conservancy feels that a blanket ban on moorings or the movement of moorings would reduce its ability to manage the Harbour in response to changes in patterns of use. Additional marina berths, boat racks and other facilities can only be created by wasting existing moorings or other boat storage facilities.

Formal Recreation and Tourism : Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPG 17, 2002: paragraphs 28, 29,31

PPG 20, 1991: paragraphs 3.4 –3.9

South East Plan Submission Draft: C2, TSR2.

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 deposit draft: CH1, CH2, NE11

Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan: R8 and R9.

Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999: RE4, C5, C6,

7.0 Informal Recreation and Tourism

POLICY K1. The Conservancy will support the sympathetic location of additional viewpoints, improvements to the rights of way network for long-term access and

those with limited mobility, provision of a cycle network and additional visitor information at appropriate locations.

1.5 million people visit Chichester Harbour AONB every year because of its unique character, landscape and tranquility. This means that any new development in the AONB needs to draw on the character of its countryside and not detract from the very asset on which its popularity depends.

The Conservancy remains concerned over the carrying capacity of the AONB and will continue to seek ways in reducing the impact of visitors on the AONB, both in terms of the visitors themselves and also how they travel to and around the AONB.

Sustainable forms of transport should be supported and the Conservancy has now established a Chichester to West Wittering cycle route to encourage a reduction in car use. Work will continue with access partners to identify improvements to existing routes and opportunities for new long-term access solutions, primarily through the Rights of Way Improvement Plans and liaison with AONB landowners.

POLICY K2. The Conservancy will seek to resist any further extension of caravan sites but would support the small scale, sympathetic conversion of existing buildings for holiday accommodation and small scale tented camping sites where this does not infringe conservation policies or create new dwellings in the countryside. (Refer to policy A4.)

The demand for tourist accommodation is served by small-scale guesthouses in the Harbour villages and by caravan sites. There is a shortage of self-catering accommodation in the AONB. The conversion of derelict or underused farm buildings can provide appropriate sites for such uses in principle. To ensure that these conversions are not lost to residential use, the Conservancy will seek holiday occupancy conditions where appropriate.

POLICY K3. The Conservancy will seek to ensure that caravan rallies, establishment of Certified Locations or other caravanning / camping related activities be for a duration, frequency and extent which is appropriate to the AONB. In addition, the location of such facilities should not have a detrimental impact upon the AONB, and visually sensitive and exposed sites should be avoided.

The presence of caravans, even in small numbers for short periods of times, can have a detrimental impact upon the AONB landscape. To ensure that their impact is reduced, exposed or visually sensitive sites should be avoided. In addition, the frequency and duration of events or rallies should be maintained at a level appropriate to the sensitive landscape of the AONB. The Conservancy will continue to work with the local Planning Authorities, landowners and the Caravanning and Camping Club to ensure that there are no detrimental landscape impacts from caravanning / camping within the AONB.

Informal Recreation and Tourism : Planning Policy Framework

These guidelines should be read within the following planning policy context:

PPG 13, 2001: paragraphs 37, 40, 41, 42

PPS 7: 18,19,21,35-40

Good Practice Guide on Planning For Tourism: Paragraphs 3.24-3.25 and 5.3,5.11. Annex A paragraph 7, Annex B.

South East Plan Submission Draft: TSR4ii, TSR5, TSR6, C3, C4.

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016: CH1, CH2, NE11, NE12

Adopted Havant Borough District Wide Local Plan 1994: C1, L1, TO3-TO6

Adopted Chichester District Local Plan Review 1999:RE4, C5, C6, R4,

8.0 Environmental management and improvements through planning conditions and Section 106 Agreements

POLICY N1. The Conservancy wishes to see landscape proposals conform to the guidelines laid down in the Landscape Character Assessment (2005) and the Chichester Harbour AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions (2007).

Particular attention will be paid to the siting, design and landscaping of all applications. Landscape proposals involving tree planting will be scrutinised to ensure that the planting is in keeping with the existing landscape and uses species typical of the AONB, and has a nature conservation value. Mechanisms to achieve the implementation of improvements to the objectives of the AONB include Section 106 agreements and planning conditions. The Conservancy will support their use where appropriate.

POLICY N2. If proposals to fell trees are made in areas identified by the landscape assessment and the tree and hedgerow survey as significant to conservation or the landscape, the Conservancy will request the local planning authority to make whatever Tree Preservation Order is necessary to enable more time for landscape and conservation considerations to be assessed.

Where trees add special interest or areas of woodland are identified as being under threat the Conservancy will seek a Tree Preservation Order where appropriate. It is recognised that protection for trees and hedgerows will at times, be required at short notice.

POLICY N3. The Conservancy will work in conjunction with its local planning authority partners to ensure that Section 106 agreements and planning conditions are used to mitigate negative impacts on the environment of the AONB and secure positive, social, economic and environmental benefits to fulfil the purposes of the designation.

The Conservancy will seek the co-operation of the local planning authorities in obtaining the necessary legal agreements to protect locations affected by development and to achieve some gains. Such agreements could cover:

- Improvements in access to the countryside, including access by the disabled.
- Sympathetic management of land of conservation value, excluding it from further pressure.
- Improvements to the general infrastructure, which encourage acceptable levels of use.

The use of planning conditions in the granting of planning permission is a way of enabling the development to take place provided that criteria set out in the conditions are met and if not can be enforced. Sometimes when planning appeals are allowed by the Planning Inspectorate their report often contains some useful model conditions. The Conservancy would support the introduction of conditions by the local planning authorities where appropriate. However planning applications should be good enough to approve and not simply made acceptable by conditions.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY**PLANNING COMMITTEE****19th DECEMBER 2011****REPORT BY CONSERVANCY OFFICERS****DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER MEMBERS DELEGATED POWERS****BO/11/04083/FUL: FLETCHERS FARM OLD PARK LANE BOSHAM CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX - INSTALLATION OF 50KW OF GROUND MOUNTED PHOTOVOLTAIC CELLS.**PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

PPS 7 paragraph 21; RE1, RE4, RE12, BE11, BE14: Adopted Chichester District Local Plan 1999. Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2004-2009: BD1, BD2: Appendix 3: Policy B5.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY'S COMMENTS

Fletchers Farm is located on the eastern part of the Bosham peninsula in the rural area, south of Old Park Lane and the Church Farm industrial site, north of Old Park Wood. This application seeks permission for the erection of an array of solar PV panels on the land directly to the south of Church Farm industrial site, to the east of a recently erected agricultural barn ('Fletchers Barn'). This would comprise 3 rows of panels up to 3 metres high occupying a total area of 37 by 22.1 metres, surrounded by green wired mesh security fencing 2 metres high. The supporting statement predicts that the panels would produce 52,500 kWh per annum, equivalent to the annual usage of 15 average UK homes.

Ground mounted solar panels when of a limited scale, sited in discreet locations and with appropriate planting can have significantly less impact on the AONB landscape than panels mounted on the roofs of buildings which are exposed to view. The site for the proposed solar panels in this instance is not exposed to public view given its position tucked behind Church Farm industrial site which is surrounded by evergreen boundary trees. In this location it is unlikely that they would be intrusive features in the landscape. We would however question the height of the proposed panels at 3 metres, given that a recent application for a ground mounted array at Wophams Lane Nursery (reference BI/11/03981/FUL) showed the highest row of panels at a maximum of 2.475 metres (with the majority of the panels being 1.36 metres high). We would ask that the applicant considers the use of lower panels such as those under that application.

However, there may be some glimpsed views from a distance from Hook Lane to the northeast and Old Park Lane when approaching from the west, and therefore it is important that planting of the existing earth bund (which has been created to the south and west of the agricultural barn) is carried out to ensure minimal or no impacts from the west. It may be more effective if shrubs or trees were planted on top of the bund rather than a seed mix as shown under the various applications to extend the agricultural barn. The application includes limited details of existing planting near the site and this planting should be retained as part of any permission granted. We would suggest that supplementary planting may be necessary directly to the east of the solar panels to ensure they are screened from view from Hook Lane, and would also comment that the gap in the tree-line along Fletchers Lane to the west would benefit from supplementary hedge screening to thicken the planting as the recently planted trees have not had time to establish. We would also ask for suitable conditions to agree details of any hardsurfacing, security lighting and further details of the proposed fencing, as well as a suitable condition to ensure that the land is reverted to agricultural use once use of the solar panels ceases.

DATE CONSIDERED: 05/12/11

CONSIDERED BY

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee sub-group under delegated powers.

DECISION

The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-

- Consider lower-height panels to reduce their visual impact;
- Detailed landscaping scheme (showing correct size of panel array) be submitted showing existing planting and proposed planting (recommend additional planting directly to the east of the panels, on top of the existing earth bund, and also to supplement the gap in the line of trees along Fletchers Lane to the west);
- Details of any security lighting and hardsurfacing and further details of proposed fencing be agreed prior to construction;
- Land be reverted to agricultural use once the panels are no longer being used.

WI/11/04224/DOM: OLD HAVEN, THE STREET, ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7AN - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE WITH BEDROOM OVER AND ERECTION OF NEW GARAGE WITH BEDROOM OVER.

PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

PPS 7 paragraph 21; RE4, BE11, H12: Adopted Chichester District Local Plan 1999. Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2004-2009: BD1: Appendix 3: Policy B3. Chichester Harbour AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY'S COMMENTS

'Old Haven' is a detached house fronting on to the Harbour at the end of 'The Street'. It is a large but simply designed building with a pitched clay tiled roof, white painted rendered elevations and blue-painted timber lattice-patterned windows. The building is highlighted as a 'positive' building in the West Itchenor Conservation Area. A double garage with accommodation above sits on the southern side of the main house, fronting onto The Street, and is linked to the house via a small pitched roof element, but has the appearance of being detached as viewed from The Street, particularly given its differing facing materials of herring-bone brickwork and timber beams with natural timber windows.

'Old Haven' is an extremely prominent site in the AONB, which forms an important part of the iconic harbour shoreline of Itchenor as viewed from the Harbour and wider landscape to the north and east, including the Bosham peninsula. It also forms an important part of the street scene within the historic core of the West Itchenor Conservation Area, and occupies a prominent position at the end of 'The Street' as one approaches the Harbour from the south, where views of the water open-up into wide vistas along the Itchenor Reach and across to the Bosham peninsula.

Conservancy officers were approached for pre-application discussions relating to a proposed scheme for a replacement dwelling on the site. During these discussions we have raised a number of concerns with the proposed size, bulk and grand appearance of the replacement dwelling which was felt to be too imposing in both the wider landscape and Conservation Area. We also raised concerns about the proposed reorientation of the main house and the increased height of the proposed replacement garage, and the impact of these elements on views from the harbour as well as the experience and views on the approach from 'The Street'.

This application seeks permission for a replacement garage of a very similar design to the existing building and of the same height, but approximately 76cm wider and approximately 107cm deeper than the existing building. The new garage would also be sited slightly further towards The Street (by just under a metre) than the existing building (the proposal is almost the same as the garage element of the scheme which was presented during the latest pre-application discussions).

We are concerned with two aspects of this scheme. Firstly, the increase in size, bulk and forward position of the building (despite what is stated in the Design and Access Statement), while minimal, would increase the impact of an already dominant building in this important part of the Conservation Area. Secondly, as raised during pre-application discussions, we are concerned about any increase to the size of this building and the impact of this in combination with the proposed replacement dwelling which is also likely to be larger than the existing building. We suggested during pre-application discussions than a lower building set further back into the site could be considered as a way of reducing the impact of this element of the overall scheme.

Given that the owner wishes to replace the existing dwelling on the site we consider that any replacement garage should be viewed alongside the proposed replacement dwelling to ensure that the whole development works together and is appropriate for this extremely sensitive and prominent site within the AONB and Conservation Area. A 'piecemeal' approach by separating out different elements of the scheme will not help to achieve the best outcome. Notwithstanding this point, the current proposal would increase the dominance of an already dominant building in this important position within the Conservation Area and AONB.

DATE CONSIDERED

05/12/11

CONSIDERED BY

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee sub-group under delegated powers.

DECISION

The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.

BO/11/04458/FUL: THE SLIP, QUAY MEADOW, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8LZ - PROVISION OF CONCRETE APRON AND DEPOSIT MARINE 'RIP-RAP' STONES.

PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

PPS 7 paragraph 21; RE4, RE7, C9, BE11: Adopted Chichester District Local Plan 1999. Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2004-2009: BD1, BD2: Appendix 3: Policy B7.

CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY'S COMMENTS

'The Slip' is a large detached house located on the edge of the Harbour just north of Quay Meadow. The western edge of the site adjoining the harbour is formed by a sloping concrete base / sea defence which extends into the Harbour by some 2 metres beyond a sea defence wall surrounding the garden to the south. This has recently been replaced with a new sea wall and concrete 'apron'. It is stated that this is based on the same footprint as the previous concrete. Works have been stopped while the applicant regularises the various consents which are required for works of this nature.

The proposals involve the addition of 'rip-rap' sea defence (constructed from Purbeck stone) onto the new concrete apron. This is the Conservancy's preferred method of sea defence as it absorbs wave energy, affords shelter for sea creatures, and attracts plant

growth in the gaps between the stones. It also weathers naturally over time which helps to ensure a sympathetic landscape impact.

It is difficult to fully assess the impact on the intertidal area given that the works have already occurred to the main concrete apron and replacement sea wall - and we are disappointed that these went ahead without the necessary permissions. However, they do appear to be on the same footprint as the previous concrete base / sea defence and the proposed 'rip-rap' method would be an improvement over the previous concrete for the reasons given above. We would ask that any permission granted includes suitable conditions to ensure that the remainder of the works are carried out in accordance with a detailed method statement, and is conditional upon various measures designed to protect the integrity of the European site and to avoid disturbance to overwintering birds. The comments of Natural England will be important in this regard.

DATE CONSIDERED

05/12/11

CONSIDERED BY

Chichester Harbour Conservancy Planning Committee sub-group under delegated powers.

DECISION

The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that remainder of the works are carried out in accordance with a detailed method statement and subject to the following:

- Removal of rubble and debris dumped on the SSSI within one month of permission being granted;
- No use of machinery to complete the works during the period 30th September to 1st April to avoid disturbance to overwintering birds. Any movement of material must be carried out by hand with use of wheel barrows during this period.
- No dumping/storage of material on the SSSI during and after completion of the works.
- No vehicular/machinery access onto the SSSI.
- All construction workers are made aware of the sensitivities of the site and the above conditions



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2011

by A Harwood CMS MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/11/2162480

Meadow House, Canute Road, Old Bosham, Chichester, Sussex, PO18 8JF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Isabel Winter against the decision of Chichester District Council.
- The application Ref BO/11/02551/DOM, dated 14 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2011.
- The development proposed is the regularisation of changes to first floor cladding.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the regularisation of changes to first floor cladding at Meadow House, Canute Road, Old Bosham, Chichester, Sussex, PO18 8JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BO/11/02551/DOM, dated 14 June 2011, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the colour of the external cladding of the building shall not be altered by painting or staining unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the change of cladding in terms of material and colour would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area (CA). In assessing this, I will also consider the impacts upon the wider Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling positioned within a very spacious plot on the eastern edge of the CA. It appears as a two storey house to the south facing Shore Road. It has an asymmetrical profile with the appearance of a chalet style bungalow to the north which is the main approach. This elevation is difficult to see from the road leading to the site because of surrounding hedges and trees. As a part of recent renovations including modernising features such as glazed balconies, the horizontal cladding which is

the subject of this application, has been included on the east, south and west elevations.

4. To the west of the site, the CA includes more tightly knit development with many buildings of traditional appearance. In terms of colours along the waterfront, the weathered red brick, roof-tiles of dwellings and grey stone along the harbour wall predominate interspersed with white painted and clad buildings. To the east of the site, there is even greater variety to the form and appearance of dwellings outside of the CA. The appeal site when viewed from Shore Road nearby as well as at a distance on the opposite, south-side of the creek provides a visual break between these more developed areas. This is due to the openness of the plot, the position of the dwelling and the presence of trees around the plot.
5. The Council points out that the amount of cladding has increased from that previously approved. However it is clear from the photographs presented as part of the Council's case that the property previously had an extensive amount of white uPVC cladding over first floor parts of the building. Although the uPVC cladding has been removed, in my experience the material has an un-natural, uniform, shiny, appearance. These attributes as well as the white colour, as can be seen from the submitted photographs, clearly drew attention to the building making it stand out. It is primarily in this context that the current proposal needs to be assessed.
6. There is some consensus between the appellant, the Council and the 'Chichester Harbour Conservancy' that timber is preferable to the previous uPVC. The larch timber used is very neatly and uniformly sawn although has a rough surface showing the grain. Other properties in the CA have less neatly cut timber perhaps reflecting the age of those properties. This dwelling however has an individual, more modern appearance and this type of timber is appropriate in my view. Along with the brickwork the materials reflect the more traditional buildings nearby.
7. I visited the site on a sunny, clear day when the pastel blue/grey colour of timber would be at its brightest. Although brighter than some colours of nearby buildings within the CA I found this, from the submitted evidence, to be more recessive than the brighter white of the previous uPVC and other nearby properties. Although the blue colour is not used commonly in the harbour area, it also looks less uniform than some of the darker grey used elsewhere. The shadows of the lapped timber were more evident than in those other cases and I consider this helps to visually break up the surface. In my opinion, this would have less of an impact than the previous uPVC cladding. It will also have an additional benefit that it will weather down further reducing the impact compared with uPVC, even if it is regularly painted.
8. Overall, I consider that the cladding in terms of its material and colour has enhanced the appearance of the property. There is no doubt that this is a picturesque location within the CA as the Council points out in referring to the Bosham Conservation Area Character Appraisal. However whatever colour of materials are used here, the large detached house will be obvious when viewed from the harbour. The retained openness and landscaping of the site would still remain.

9. In relation to the main issue the cladding enhances the character or appearance of the CA and the development complies with policies BE11 and BE12 of the Chichester District Local Plan adopted April 1999 (LP). Furthermore, the cladding does not have a harmful impact upon the wider AONB therefore complying with LP policy RE4.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested the standard matching materials and time-limit conditions. However, with respects to the tests for conditions in Circular 11/95 "The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions" given the materials do not match the rest of the existing dwelling and the development has been completed, these are unnecessary. As already mentioned by the Council, the cladding of dwellings within CAs and AONBs requires planning permission however, in order to prevent re-painting in an inappropriate colour, I have attached a condition to ensure permission is needed for re-painting or staining in a different colour. In the circumstances of this case I consider, that such a condition is necessary.

Overall Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Harwood

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2011

by **David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 December 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/11/2163718

Hove To, Smugglers Lane, Bosham, Chichester PO18 8QP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Chamberlain against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref BO/11/02471/DOM, dated 8 June 2011, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2011.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the existing roof from the chalet style bungalow, construction of first floor and replacement roof above. Extension to the swimming pool, to be retained within existing decked area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the removal of the existing roof from the chalet style bungalow, construction of first floor and replacement roof above. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the extension to the swimming pool and planning permission is granted for the extension to the swimming pool, to be retained within existing decked area, at Hove To, Smugglers Lane, Bosham, Chichester PO18 8QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BO/11/02471/DOM, dated 8 June 2011, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 10-002-13, 10-002-11 and 10-002-12.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the swimming pool extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing structure.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area which lies within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

3. The site lies in a very prominent position on the edge of a creek and it is visually very exposed, particularly as there are no significant boundary features to the rear of the properties in this part of Smugglers Lane. The existing

property is a chalet style bungalow and it fits comfortably into its setting which is primarily characterised by buildings which are of a modest size and scale. There are a few larger dwellings in Smugglers Lane but these are the exception rather than the rule.

4. The main ridge height of the dwelling would increase from about 6.8m to 8.9m and the height of the projecting hips from about 5.5m to 7.7m. This intensification of built form would result in a building which would appear bulky and incongruous in this setting. The Council refer to the increase in glazing, particularly on the southern elevation and I agree that such an expanse of glazing (even non-reflective) would be a further element that would detract from the character of the area. Although this is not a matter on which my decision has turned it adds weight to my conclusion on the first issue.
5. Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas confirms that AONBs have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. I have therefore given this designation great weight. Similarly I have attached significant weight to the advice in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing which states that design which is inappropriate in its context should not be accepted.
6. Saved policies RE4, H12, C1, BE11 and BE12 of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review seek to ensure that development would be of an appropriate design, not detract from its surroundings, not be harmful to the appearance of the AONB and respect the setting of Chichester Harbour. I conclude that for the reasons given above this proposal would not meet those requirements.

Other Matters, Conditions and Conclusion

7. The Council confirms that the proposed extension to the swimming pool would be acceptable and I agree that because of its size and form it would not have a detrimental visual impact on the appearance of the area and that it should be permitted. With regard to the swimming pool I have imposed the standard time condition and for the avoidance of doubt, a condition to ensure compliance with the plans. The Council suggested a condition relating to materials and finishes to be agreed and whilst this would have been necessary for the proposed dwelling, I consider that for the pool, in the interests of protecting the character of the area, a condition which only requires the use of matching materials would meet the six tests set out in Circular 11/95: The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions and I impose it accordingly.
8. I saw that work was underway at the adjacent property known as West Dean but I have not been given full details of that scheme and can therefore only give it little weight.
9. I have taken into account the Draft National Planning Policy Framework but because of its status I have given it little weight.
10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the quality of the proposed materials, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the construction of a first floor and replacement roof.

David Hogger

Inspector



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2011

by A Harwood CMS MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/11/2162542

The Strawberry Tree, Sunny Way, Bosham, Chichester, Sussex, PO18 8HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lane against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref BO/11/02288/DOM, dated 7 December 2010, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2011.
 - The development proposed is the forming of a new first floor with raised roof and dormers and the forming of a new double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the forming of a new first floor with raised roof and dormers and the forming of a new double garage at The Strawberry Tree, Sunny Way, Bosham, Chichester, Sussex, PO18 8HQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref BO/11/02288/DOM, dated 7 December 2010, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The dormer window closest to Hope Cottage on the first floor rear elevation, shall be permanently obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m from finished floor level in accordance with details which shall have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan referenced '3035.10.1 B'.

Procedural Matter and Main Issues

2. The road name shown on the application forms was 'Sunway'. As I saw at my site visit, as clarified on the appeal forms and other correspondence, the road is actually called 'Sunny Way'.
 3. There are two main issues. The first is the impact of the proposed garage upon the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. The
-

second is the effect upon living conditions at the adjoining properties with respect to any potential overlooking from the rear dormers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a bungalow within a spacious garden. It is proposed to raise the roof to create additional first-floor living accommodation as well as a new garage towards the front of the site. The Council considers the alterations to the dwelling would be acceptable in terms of the impact upon its character and appearance and I agree.
4. The proposed large, detached garage would have a ridged roof with half-hipped ends reflecting the proposed design of the alterations to the dwelling. It would be positioned more than 2m from the front boundary, behind an evergreen hedge. The garage would appear, as one approaches along Sunny Way from the north, against the side of the dwelling which would be even higher as a result of these proposals. Although a corner of the garage would protrude beyond the front of the house, much of the structure would be set behind the outbuilding close to the boundary within the garden of 'Hope Cottage' and a close boarded fence on that boundary. From the south and front, the garage would be seen against the side of 'Hope Cottage'. Even if some damage were to occur to the evergreen hedge along the front boundary thereby exposing the development, the design and use of materials to match the dwelling would be consistent here.
5. I therefore consider that the proposed garage would have an acceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. It will comply in these respects with policies BE11, BE12 and BE13 of the Chichester District Local Plan adopted April 1999 (LP).

Living Conditions

6. The proposed rear dormer windows would face towards the north-west. There would be sufficient distance to the rear boundary of the property to prevent any significant overlooking of the gardens of properties in Church Meadow. The dormers would also face away from the adjoining garden for 'Pennyfield' and would not cause any significant loss of privacy for those residents.
 7. From the northernmost dormer on the rear elevation of the proposed first floor alterations it would be possible to look down, over the boundary fence into the courtyard to the side of 'Hope Cottage'. It would also face towards the first floor window of that property and therefore substantially reduce the privacy for occupants of that dwelling. These impacts could be overcome by the installation of fixed and obscure glazing. Whilst the Council is concerned that a condition requiring this could be subsequently relaxed, this would not be justified in my opinion if the material circumstances remain as they are at the moment. A condition to this effect is included in this decision based upon the Council's suggestion, because I consider it is necessary with respect to Circular 11/95 "The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions".
 8. With the inclusion of this condition the proposal will have an acceptable impact upon living conditions at the adjoining properties. It would comply with LP policy BE11.
-

Conditions

9. I have also considered all suggested conditions with respects to Circular 11/95. The standard matching materials and time-limit conditions are necessary in this case as is a condition to require that the approved plans are complied with, in the interests of proper planning. The suggested condition requiring that the garage is used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling is unnecessary because that is the purpose for which it has been applied for. If a subsequent material change of use occurs, the Council would have existing enforcement powers which could be considered.

Overall Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Harwood

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2011

by **Alan Woolnough BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/A/11/2155399

**Land to rear of Mansfield, Church Lane, Birdham, Chichester, West Sussex
PO20 7AP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs J Manning against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application ref no BI/11/00233/FUL, dated 9 February 2011, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2011.
 - The development proposed is a detached bungalow and garage.
-

Formal Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The appeal site lies within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the statutory purpose of which is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. Under section 85(1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 I am required, in determining a planning application in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB, to have regard to the statutory purpose of the designation. However, in this case neither the Council nor any other party has suggested that this would be compromised in any way by the proposal, and I concur. The main issue in determining this appeal is therefore limited to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the immediate surrounding area rather than the wider landscape.

Reasoning

3. The site lies within the settlement boundary of Birdham as defined by the development plan. I found this corner of the village to be characterised by detached dwellings within substantial plots, set well back from the road behind extensive front gardens and significant belts of greenery, including a number of mature trees. Although, aside from the AONB, the locality is not subject to any specific protective designation, it nonetheless enjoys an attractively spacious and sylvan sense of place, in contrast to higher density development on the opposite side of the road.
4. The appeal site once formed part of the rear garden of Mansfield, a bungalow with a hipped roof served by a private driveway leading from Church Lane, but is now severed from that property by a substantial garden fence. The same track provides access to Hoots Barn, another bungalow located in a backland position to the north-east of the potential development plot. The proposal,

which would also be single storey, would occupy the land which presently separates these two existing dwellings.

5. My attention has been drawn to two dismissed appeals against previous refusals of planning permission for infill development on this site, dating from June 2001 (ref no APP/L3815/A/01/1059130) and December 2003 (ref no APP/L3815/A/03/1124539). The current proposal presents an alternative design to try and overcome the objections to those schemes. Key features include a low ridge line, a reconfiguration of access arrangements, the provision of a screen fence spanning the gap between the existing property's garage and the driveway serving Hoots Barn and the provision of a low-lying flat-roofed garage adjacent to the latter.
6. These aspects of the appeal development would all help to reduce its impact on the street scene in comparison with that which would have arisen from the previous schemes such that, with the benefit of screen landscaping, only parts of the roof and upper elevation could be glimpsed in public views from Church Lane and Springfield Close. However, planting is, by its very nature, impermanent and, therefore, its ongoing presence could not reasonably be secured by a condition attached to a grant of planning permission. A covenant, as suggested by the Appellant, would present similar problems of enforceability and, in any event, there is no legal undertaking of any kind before me.
7. Fencing low enough to be visually acceptable in itself, within the remaining curtilage of Mansfield and along the boundaries of the site, would only be effective in screening the lower part of the proposed dwelling. The scheme's reduced prominence, as depicted in the submitted 'street scene' drawing, would otherwise be dependent on existing and additional trees, bushes and hedges which, if removed, would expose much of the upper elevation and roof to full view from the road.
8. I accept that there is no public vantage point from which the relative sizes of the plots may be ascertained. Nonetheless, in the absence of screen planting, perceptions of the building would not be limited to glimpses of small parts of the building, as suggested by the Appellant. Rather, a substantial proportion of the dwelling would be clearly visible, such that it would read in tandem with the dwellings to the immediate north-east and south-west as cramped development harmful to its spacious setting. I find, in contrast to the Inspector who determined the 2001 appeal, that a marked increase in the density of the development in this part of the village would thus be readily apparent.
9. I conclude that the proposal has clear potential to detract to an unacceptable degree from the character and appearance of the surrounding area and seriously erode the prevailing sense of place. A soft landscaping scheme could not be relied upon to guard against this as its retention and maintenance would not be readily enforceable in the longer term. The appeal scheme is therefore contrary to Policies SP3, BE1 and SCT1 of the South East Plan 2009, saved Policies BE11 and BE13 of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review 1999 (LP) and national policy in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: *Delivering Sustainable Development* and PPS3: *Housing*.

Other Matters

10. I have taken into account all other matters raised. Whilst I note the Appellant's willingness to consider a further reduction in the bulk of the roof if

need be, no such proposal is before me to consider. Although paragraph 12 of the 2003 appeal decision refers to compliance with saved LP Policy BE11, this appears to be a reference to the effect of that scheme on residential amenity, as conflict with that policy is clearly identified elsewhere in the decision.

11. Contrary to the Appellant's understanding, the South East Plan remains part of the development plan. Whilst I have borne in mind the Secretary of State's intention to cancel it in due course, it remains in force for the time being and carries significant weight for the purposes of my decision. I have considered whether the recently published draft National Planning Policy Framework proposes any significant changes to existing national policies that are relevant to the determination of this appeal. I find that it does not and, therefore, has no effect. In any event, the fact that the said guidance is yet to be finalised tempers the weight that may be attributed to it.
12. National guidance in PPS3 has been revised so as to omit the national indicative minimum density for residential development and exclude private residential gardens from the definition of previously developed land. However, the revisions do not introduce blanket protection for residential gardens and allegations of 'garden grabbing' made by some have not therefore played a significant part in my decision in this case. I accept that the proposal complies with certain objectives of national and development plan policy identified by the Appellant, including efficiency in the use of land, and find no conflict with the promotion of sustainable development inherent therein.
13. Garden and parking facilities for both Mansfield and the additional dwelling would be adequate and additional pressures on local facilities would not be excessive. I also acknowledge that the proposal has no adverse implications for the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, note the support for the scheme forthcoming from some local residents and am aware that the Chichester Harbour Conservancy raises no objection. However, neither these nor any other matters are of such significance as to outweigh the considerations that have led to my conclusion on the main issue.

Alan Woolnough

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2011

by Nicola Linihan BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 December 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/A/11/2156480

2 Critchfield Road, Bosham, Chichester PO18 8HH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Edward Rees (Regent Properties) against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref BO/11/02145/OUT, dated 9 May 2011, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2011.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 no. 2 bedroom starter home.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. No representative of the appellant was present at the scheduled site visit. Following the agreement of the landowner and the Council I undertook an unaccompanied site visit. No comments have been received by either the appellant or the Council raising issues with this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The site lies within a predominantly residential area within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site forms part of the garden of No. 2 Critchfield Road whilst the access to the site would be taken from Merryweather Road. To the south of the site is a car park which forms part of the curtilage of a now disused fire station. A terrace of bungalows lies to the east of the site, with residential gardens to the north and west. The proposal is for outline permission for the erection of a single 2 bedroom starter home with access and layout to be determined at this stage.
 5. Development within the vicinity of the proposal is characterised by single storey and two storey houses of a simple design, with wide frontage verges. A number of properties fronting onto Bosham Lane to the south have garages located to the rear with access from Merryweather Road. The bungalows to the east of
-

the site are set back from the road frontage and at an angle, and are not a dominant feature within the street scene. The plot sizes of these bungalows are relatively small. However, the predominant character of the surrounding area is one of residential properties set in relatively large plots, which, together with the wide verges, creates a sense of spaciousness and openness.

6. The introduction of a dwelling, even of a single storey design, as indicated in the proposal, would significantly erode the spacious and open character of the area. Although there are similar size dwellings in small plots nearby, they follow a traditional pattern of development with front elevations and front gardens facing onto Merryweather Road. The proposed plot is constrained with no proper frontage onto the public realm apart from a small vehicular access. As a result of this, the dwelling fills up most of the width of the plot with three elevations very close to boundaries, and would appear cramped when viewed from Merryweather Road. The proposed dwelling would be of an irregular shape and would appear awkward and contrived, bearing no relationship to the pattern or character of development in the area. Whilst the proposal would make a small contribution to the provision of new housing in the area the benefits of this are not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that the proposal would cause to the character of the surrounding area.
7. I have considered the concerns raised in relation to access and on-street parking. An existing access is to be used as part of the proposal together with the provision of an on-site parking space. Furthermore, the level of additional traffic and parking that is likely to be generated by this proposal would be extremely limited. Concern has also been raised in relation to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of No. 5 Merryweather Road and of future occupiers of the proposed dwelling. However, the space between No 5 and the proposal, together with the fact that such matters would be fully assessed through the submission of detailed plans, is such that insufficient harm has been demonstrated. I do not consider that sufficient harm would be caused in relation to either of these points to warrant refusal on these matters.
8. Policies RE4, BE11 and BE13 of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review seek to ensure that development does not detract from its surroundings, would not damage the character of the built environment, and would conserve and enhance the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The proposal would not result in a visually acceptable relationship with the wider pattern of development within the surrounding area which has an open and spacious character. As such it would cause harm to the character and appearance of this area, contrary to development plan policy objectives outlined above. As the proposal is for a small-scale development within residential surroundings it would only have a localised impact. Nevertheless it would fail to conserve this part of the AONB. The proposal would therefore undermine the aims and objectives of Local Plan policy in this regard and the appeal is dismissed.

Nicola Linihan

INSPECTOR

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
04/01/2011	BO/10/05352/DOM	CDC	TARA, SMUGGLERS LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8QW	TWO-STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection)</i>
06/01/2011	CC/10/05534/FUL	CDC	28 AND 29 KINGS AVENUE, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO19 8EA	ERECTION OF SIX DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING FOLLOWING THE DEMOLITION OF TWO EXISTING BUNGALOWS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
06/01/2011	CH/10/05728/PNO	CDC	MANOR FARM, COT LANE, CHIDHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8SX	CROP STORE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/samples of materials to be submitted and agreed in writing, to ensure these are appropriately muted colours to match the adjacent building, particularly given the exposed nature of the site within the wider landscape (visible for some distance from the north, east and from the Harbour to the west). • Detailed landscaping scheme to be agreed to mitigate the impact of a further building in this exposed position - suggest comprehensive scheme to soften the impact of the whole group of buildings from the west and north in particular. 	PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED
06/01/2011	BI/10/05426/DOM	CDC	OAKHURST CROOKED LANE BIRDHAM	PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION, FRONT PORCH AND	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX PO20 7HB	REPLACEMENT WINDOWS.		
07/01/2011	BI/10/05676/ELD	CDC	WESTLANDS FARM, WESTLANDS LANE, BIRDHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7HH	3 NO. CLASS C3 PRIVATE DWELLINGHOUSES.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no evidence to offer to assist the Council in the determination of the following 'existing lawful development' application.</p> <p>We would however like to express our concern at the number of recent instances where 'lawful' use of a building as a private dwelling is being sought by applicants as a result of an on-going breach of planning control. This is particularly worrying as planning permission would not have been granted for use as private dwellings in this instance as it is contrary to countryside policies. We feel that this recent trend underlines the need for a suitable mechanism to be put in place by the Council for monitoring such uses where possible to help ensure that this does not keep occurring, as a proliferation of breaches of planning control such as these within the AONB would be seriously damaging to its rural character.</p>	<p>CERTIFICATE GRANTED FOR 1 DWELLING ONLY</p> <p>APPEAL DECISIONS REPORTED TO 21ST NOVEMBER 2011</p> <p>PLANNING COMMITTEE</p>
10/01/2011	APP/10/01022	HBC	15 BRIDGEFOOT PATH, EMSWORTH, PO10 7EA	PROPOSED LOFT CONVERSION WITH FRONT AND REAR DORMER.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
11/01/2011	SB/10/05697/OUT	CDC	3A GORDON ROAD, SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8AZ	DEMOLITION OF VACANT COMMERCIAL PREMISES AND ERECTION OF 3 NO. 2 BED HOUSES AND 2 NO. DETACHED CHALET	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that particular matters/conditions be negotiated if possible, as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would ask that if permission is granted, it be subject to a suitable condition to 	AWAITING CONSIDERATION

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
				BUNGALOWS.	require the retention and management of the trees on site and suitable soft landscaping and boundary treatments for the frontage onto Gordon Road.	
11/01/2011	CC/10/05597/OUT	CDC	LAND AT KINGSMEAD AVENUE, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX	OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR 51 NO. MARKET AND AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS, ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application in the absence of sufficient information to demonstrate no adverse impacts.	APPROVED SUBJECT TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENT <i>(No objection from Natural England or the Environment Agency)</i>
12/01/2011	WE/11/00010/FUL	CDC	HOPEDENE, COMMON ROAD, HAMBROOK, CHICHESTER, PO18 8UP	CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING FARMSHOP AND POLYTUNNEL TO MIXED USE FARM/ RURAL SUPPLIES SHOP (ON SITE PRODUCE / SERVICES 40%: RURAL ANIMAL SUPPLIES / SERVICES SHOP 60%).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
12/01/2011	BO/10/05678/FUL	CDC	FIVE ELMS, STUMPS LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8QJ	CHANGE OF USE OF INTEGRAL GARAGE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION AND GARDEN STORE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials and finishes (including colour) of proposed new windows/doors to match existing; • Permitted development rights for extensions, alterations or outbuildings be removed; • Retention and management of the boundary hedge. 	REFUSED <i>(**conflict** -appeal decision reported to 19th September 2011 planning committee)</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
14/01/2011	BO/11/00085/TCA	CDC	1 NEW BUILDINGS, THE TRIPPET, SHORE ROAD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, PO18 8JD	NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO FELL 1 NO. MONTEREY CYPRESS TREE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would ask that a suitable replacement tree is planted, of a native species typical of the AONB. A list of recommended native species is included on page 3 of the AONB Design Guidelines for New Dwellings and Extensions - we would particularly recommend English Oak for this position. 	NO TPO MADE <i>(‘Informative’ included as requested)</i>
17/01/2011	BO/11/00040/DOM	CDC	LITTLE CREED COTTAGE, 3 GREEN LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8NT	REAR KITCHEN, A GARDEN TOOM AND UTILITY ROOM EXTENSION; NEW BIKE STORE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
17/01/2011	BO/11/00110/FUL	CDC	UNIT 5, BROADBRIDGE BUSINESS CENTRE, DELLING LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX PO18 8NF	ERECTION OF 2 NO. HOLIDAY LETS IN LIEU OF COMMERCIAL (B1) BUILDINGS PREVIOUSLY GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER REFERENCES BO/07/06036/FUL AND BO/08/03561/FUL.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection)</i>
17/01/2011	APP/10/01021	HBC	35 BRIDGEFOOT PATH, EMSWORTH, PO10 7EB	APPLICATION TO REMOVE WINDOWS TO THE NORTH ELEVATION OF THE EXISTING SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND TO CHANGE THE FLAT ROOF OF SAME TO A PITCHED ROOF WITH 6 NO.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
				VELUX ROOFLIGHTS. NEW DORMER TO EAST (REAR) ROOF SLOPE.		
18/01/2011	WI/10/04537/FUL (A)	CDC	ITCHENOR GATE FARM ITCHENOR ROAD WEST ITCHENOR CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX PO20 7DA	CONSTRUCTION OF GRANARY/BOAT STORE	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials and colours/finishes to be agreed by condition and to be dark/olive greens and/or browns where possible; • External lighting be controlled by a suitable condition; • No maintenance or repair be carried out on boats and storage be restricted to inside the building only; • Conditions recommended by Environmental Health relating to the grain dryers be imposed; • A suitable condition which ensures that access to the new barn from Itchenor Road utilises the existing access (as shown on the layout plan) and no separate access is created. 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i></p>
18/01/2011	WI/10/05379/FUL	CDC	ITCHENOR GATE FARM ITCHENOR ROAD WEST ITCHENOR CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX PO20 7DA	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW DWELLING AND DETACHED GREENHOUSE.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <p>Conditions imposed on WI/09/00138/FUL be imposed on any permission granted, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfer of agricultural tie from existing dwelling; 	<p>REFUSED</p> <p><i>(on grounds of excessive floorspace and cramped appearance created by siting of outbuilding)</i></p>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/samples of materials be submitted and agreed (to include finish for greenhouse frame); • Retention of existing trees and provision of new native hedgerow planting on northwest and southwest boundaries; • Removal of permitted development rights for extensions and alterations. • 	
18/01/2011	APP/11/00027	HBC	19B KING STREET, EMSWORTH, PO10 7AX	FORMING OF NEW GROUND FLOOR WINDOW OPENING IN WEST EXTERNAL WALL OF EXISTING DWELLING.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
19/01/2011	BO/10/05566/FUL	CDC	LAND WEST OF DELLING CLOSE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX.	PROPOSED PLAYING FIELD, PARKING AND PAVILION FOR BOSHAM CRICKET CLUB.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable conditions be imposed to control the use and its hours of operation (conditions 2, 7, 8, 9 10, 13 of BO/02/01673/FUL); • A suitable landscaping scheme be agreed, implemented, managed and maintained in perpetuity, including new planting of native species typical of the area, in consultation with the Conservancy; • Suitable conditions to control means of enclosure and external lighting (conditions 6 and 13 of BO/02/01673/FUL); • Suitable conditions to agree a schedule/samples of final materials and 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i></p>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					<p>finishes (of the buildings (condition 14 of BO/02/01673/FUL); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable condition to agree the materials and finish for the proposed access track. 	
19/01/2011	WI/11/00152/TCA	CDC	OLD HAVEN, THE STREET, ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7AN	NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO FELL 1 NO. BAY LAUREL TREE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	NO TPO MADE
19/01/2011	WW/11/00079/DOM	CDC	NASIB, SHIPTON GREEN, ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, PO20 7BZ	PROPOSED SINGLE-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, WITH CLADDING TO DWELLING, ANNEX AND GARAGE OUTBUILDINGS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p>(**conflict**)</p>
24/01/2011	BO/11/00206/FUL	CDC	BROUGHTON COTTAGE, BOSHAM HOE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8ES	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT DWELLING WITH ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention and on-going management of the boundary planting; • Schedule/samples of materials to be agreed. 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included, apart from condition regarding planting)</i></p>
24/01/2011	FB/11/00101/DOM	CDC	PENDRILLS COTTAGE, MILL LANE, FISHBOURNE, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO19 3JN	EXTENSIONS TO FRONT, SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS AND ERECTION OF A SINGLE GARAGE.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of existing trees and hedgerows including the Beech hedgerows to the south and west of the building; • Provision of new native species planting along the remaining south elevation; 	<p>REFUSED</p> <p><i>(on grounds of being over dominant in relation to the Listed Building – subsequent appeal allowed, as reported to 27th June 2011 planning committee)</i></p>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/sample of materials to be submitted and agreed; • Permitted development rights for extensions, alterations or outbuildings be removed. • 	
24/01/2011	SB/11/00090/FUL	CDC	THORNHAM MARINA, THORNHAM LANE, SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8DD	REPLACE EXISTING PONTOONS WITH NEW PONTOONS AND NEW LAYOUT. REMOVAL OF 8 SWINGING MOORINGS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (REVISED PLANS – see further entry below)
24/01/2011	BO/11/00175/EXT	CDC	6 MORETON ROAD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX PO18 8LL	EXTENSION TO PLANNING PERMISSION BO/08/00528/DOM - ADDITION OF ROOM IN ROOF, INTERNAL STAIRCASE, FULL HEIGHT WINDOW WITH JULIETTE BALCONY AT SECOND FLOOR LEVEL TO SOUTH ELEVATION AND 2 NO. ROOFLIGHTS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
24/01/2011	SB/10/05495/FUL	CDC	EMSWORTH YACHT HARBOUR THORNEY ROAD SOUTHBOURNE EMSWORTH HANTS PO10 8BW	PORTACABIN TO BE USED AS AN ADDITIONAL TRAINING ROOM FOR CLASSROOM BASED COURSES IN THE MARINE INDUSTRY	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the final appearance be agreed by condition; • Temporary permission be considered to prevent the permanent siting of a portacabin in this position. 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i></p>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
25/01/2011	WI/11/00049/FUL	CDC	LITTLE COURT, ITCHENOR ROAD, ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, PO20 7DD	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING 4-BEDROOM DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT WITH A NEW 4-BEDROOM DWELLING.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/samples of materials to be agreed; (if timber cladding is used, suggest a dark stain); • Suitable conditions to ensure the retention of boundary planting and provision of the replacement trees within the frontage (to involve consultation with the Conservancy); • Permitted development rights for extensions be removed; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration be given to integrated solar PV tiles rather than upstanding panels. 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>
26/01/2011	BO/11/00211/FUL	CDC	OLD PARK FARM, OLD PARK LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8EX.	CHANGE OF USE OF REDUNDANT B1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNITS TO DOMESTIC GARAGING AND STORAGE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection)</i>
27/01/2011	E/11/00325/FUL	CDC	LITTLECROFT CARAVAN PARK, SOMERLY LANE, EAST WITTERING, PO20 7JB	USE OF PERMITTED HOLIDAY CARAVANS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR SUBJECT TO THEIR OCCUPATION BEING LIMITED TO HOLIDAY USE ONLY (AMENDMENT OF CONDITIONS 2 AND 7 ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION EW/21/49F AND CONDITION 2 ATTACHED TO EW/59/95).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
27/01/2011	SB/11/00282/LBC	CDC	WALNUT TREE FARM, PRINSTED LANE, PRINSTED, SOUTHBOURNE, WEST SUSSEX. PO10 8HS	ALTERATIONS TO ROOF AND WINDOWS OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY. ADDITION OF 2 NO. DOUBLE DOOR OPENINGS TO BARN. STRUCTURAL REPAIR TO WEST ELEVATION OF MAIN HOUSE. REPAIRS TO STONE AND BRICKWORK ON MAIN HOUSE AS INDICATED ON WEST AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS. REPAIRS TO THATCH ON MAIN HOUSE. REPAIRS TO TIMBER SOLE PLATE ON NORTH ELEVATION OF MAIN HOUSE. STRUCTURAL REPAIR TO ROOF STRUCTURE OF CAR PORT.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
28/01/2011	BO/11/00086/DOM	CDC	MERMAID COTTAGE, SHORE ROAD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX PO18 8QL	RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR REPLACEMENT FENCING TO NORTH AND EAST BOUNDARY.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection)</i>
28/01/2011	BO/11/00120/DOM	CDC	TIDEMARK SPINNEY LANE ITCHENOR CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX PO20 7DJ	REPLACEMENT GARAGE, INCLUDING BOAT STORE AND POOL HOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED GROUNDWORKS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suitable condition to require that the two-storey extension on the northwest corner of the main house is removed prior to the completion of the proposed garage/boat store/pool house. • A schedule and/or samples of materials be 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included, except relating to two- storey extension which has been retained)</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					<p>submitted and agreed (including window frames and gable elements).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A condition to require the planting of suitable replacement of trees of native species to replace those which appear to have been lost. • The submission of a landscaping scheme showing the retention of the front boundary hedge onto Spinney Lane and the retention of all remaining trees and hedges on the site. • A suitable condition or legal agreement be put in place to ensure that the proposed garage/boat store/pool house remains ancillary to 'Tidemark' and is not sold, let or lived in as a separate dwelling contrary to the Council and Conservancy's policies. The bat mitigation measures are implemented as recommended. 	
31/01/2011	SB/11/00329/DOM	CDC	25 THE CRESCENT, SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8JS	DEMOLISH EXISTING REAR CONSERVATORY AND ERECT A NEW SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
01/02/2011	BO/11/00339/DOM	CDC	FURZEFIELD COTTAGE, BOSHAM HOE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8ET	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A DOUBLE GARAGE AND GARDEN STORE WITH ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main ridge height be reduced; • Projecting hipped element on north 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included apart from retention of trees. Ridge height also not</i></p>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					<p>elevation be removed or reduced in height;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suitable condition to ensure that the trees on the north boundary are retained; • Schedule/samples of materials be submitted and agreed and maintained in perpetuity; and • Building to be used for ancillary purposes only in connection with 'Furzefield Cottage' and not to be sold, let or used as a separate dwelling in this countryside location. 	<i>reduced).</i>
02/02/2011	APP/11/00049	HBC	SPARKES BOATYARD 38 WITTERING ROAD HAYLING ISLAND PO11 9SR	ERECTION OF 4 NO. SOLAR ENERGY PANELS ON EXISTING ROOF.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
03/02/2011	CH/11/00387/AGR	CDC	MANOR FARM, COT LANE, CHIDHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8SX	CROP STORE.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further details/samples of materials to be submitted and agreed in writing, to ensure these are appropriately muted colours to match the adjacent building, particularly given the exposed nature of the site within the wider landscape (visible for some distance from the north, east and from the Harbour to the west). • Submitted landscaping scheme to be implemented in the first available planting 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i></p>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					season following construction of the new building; however, recommend the addition of suitable hedgerow standards (e.g. English Oak) to further break up the massing and silhouette of the buildings in wider views.	
03/02/2011	BO/11/00230/DOM	CDC	BRAMFIELD, WALTON LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8QB	2 NO. DORMERS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
04/02/2011	WI/11/00408/DOM	CDC	HENLEY CROFT, ITCHENOR ROAD, WEST ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7DA	SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
04/02/2011	APP/10/00763	HBC	10 SOUTH STREET, EMSWORTH, PO10 7EH	LISTED BUILDING CONSENT TO REPLACE 3 NO. FIRST FLOOR WINDOWS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
08/02/2011	CH/11/00105/DOM	CDC	EASTLANDS, CHIDHAM LANE, CHIDHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8TF	SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION, ROOF EXTENSION (INCLUDING NEW DORMERS AND VELUX WINDOWS), REPLACEMENT ENTRANCE PORCH AND TIMBER CLADDING ON ELEVATIONS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention of boundary planting (particularly to the east boundary); Finish of the proposed timber cladding to be agreed (suggest a natural finish or a dark stain). 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>
11/02/2011	BO/11/00336/AGR	CDC	FLETCHERS FARM OLD PARK LANE BOSHAM CHICHESTER WEST	EXTENSION TO EXISTING CROP STORE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy defers its decision until confirmation for the need for an extension of this size, and in the	APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			SUSSEX		proposed position, has been confirmed by the agricultural adviser. In the absence of this information, recommend refuse.	
11/02/2011	BO/11/00488/DOM	CDC	10 MORETON ROAD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8LL	RESUBMISSION OF PREVIOUS APPLICATION BO/10/05002/DOM. SINGLE-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND REAR DORMER WINDOW.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
15/02/2011	BI/11/00556/TPA	CDC	AREA OF LAND BETWEEN CHICHESTER SHIP CANAL TOWPATH AND REAR BOUNDARIES OF LOCKS LANE PROPERTIES, LOCK LANE, BIRDHAM, WEST SUSSEX	CROWN REDUCE BY 33% ON THE TALLEST LOMBARDY POPLAR TREE (WITHIN THE GROUP), REDUCE ALL OTHER TREES IN GROUP TO THE SAME HEIGHT ON 42 NO. LOMBARDY POPLAR TREES. FELL 1 NO. LOMBARDY POPLAR TREE, ALL SUBJECT TO BI/98/00035/TPO.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bat survey be carried out prior to any permission being granted, and any necessary mitigation be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of that survey - as this is an area of very high bat activity. 	APPROVED
15/02/2011	BO/11/00448/DOM	CDC	TIDEWATERS, WINDMILL FIELD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8LH	AMENDMENT TO BOAT HOUSE APPROVED UNDER REF: BO/10/03787/DOM. CHANGES TO FENESTRATIONS AND REMOVAL OF EXTERNAL STAIRCASE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suitable condition to require a schedule/samples of materials and finishes to be agreed and maintained in perpetuity; to ensure that the window frames on the new boat house match those on the main house, and that the proposed balcony 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					balustrade is constructed from timber of a suitable finish.	
15/02/2011	BO/11/00390/DOM	CDC	FOXWOOD BOSHAM HOE BOSHAM CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8ES	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND SHED AND ERECTION OF AN EXTENSION COMPRISING SWIMMING POOL, CHANGING ROOM, LAUNDRY AND PLANT ROOM AND A DOUBLE GARAGE AND CARPORT WITH OFFICE OVER.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	APPLICATION WITHDRAWN
16/02/2011	SB/11/00655/DOM	CDC	WALNUT TREE FARM, PRINSTED LANE, PRINSTED, SOUTHBOURNE, WEST SUSSEX. PO10 8HS	ALTERATIONS AND STRUCTURAL REPAIRS TO HOUSE AND CAR PORT.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
16/02/2011	BI/11/00233/FUL	CDC	MANSFIELD CHURCH LANE BIRDHAM CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX PO20 7AP	PROPOSED DETACHED BUNGALOW AND GARAGE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	REFUSED APPEAL DISMISSED – SEE LAST ITEM ON AGENDA.
16/02/2011	CH/11/00257/FUL	CDC	MILL FARM, HAMBROOK HILL SOUTH, HAMBROOK, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8UJ	CONSTRUCTION OF FRESHWATER LAGOON FOR SCUBA DIVING IN PART OF EXISTING AGRICULTURAL FIELD. ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING ON ADJACENT SCRUB LAND.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
17/02/2011	SB/11/00503/DOM	CDC	22A GORDON ROAD,	DORMERS TO FRONT AND	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the	REFUSED

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, PO10 8AZ	REAR IN CONNECTION WITH LOFT CONVERSION.	Conservancy has no objection to this application.	<i>(on grounds of dominance on roof - mentions AONB)</i>
17/02/2011	BO/11/00569/FUL	CDC	OLD PARK FARM, OLD PARK LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8EX.	SOLAR PANEL INSTALLATION TO ROOF OF REDUNDANT B1 UNIT (SUBJECT OF CHANGE OF USE APPLICATION BO/11/00211/FUL TO DOMESTIC STORAGE AND GARAGING).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
18/02/2011	APP/10/00884	HBC	16-18 WEST STREET, EMSWORTH, PO10 7DY	CHANGE OF USE OF SMALL EXTERNAL STORE FROM B1 TO MICRO-BREWERY (SUI GENERIS).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
18/02/2011	BO/11/00471/FUL	CDC	SANDERLINGS, BOSHAM HOE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8ES	PROPOSED REPLACEMENT DWELLING.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary trees and hedgerows to be retained and managed by condition and supplementary planting be agreed and implemented; • Materials, finishes and colours to be agreed by condition, including window frames, balcony balustrade, fascias/soffits and gutters; • Garage/boathouse to remain ancillary to 'The Wheelhouse' and not to be sold, let or lived in separately or used for commercial purposes; 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permitted development rights for extensions, alterations or outbuildings be removed; and Integrated 'Solar tiles' be considered as an alternative to solar panels on the southwest roof slopes. 	
21/02/2011	BO/11/00702/DOM	CDC	CREEK HOUSE, SHORE ROAD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8QL.	REMOVAL AND ALTERATION OF PART OF BOUNDARY FENCING, AND RETENTION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE BOUNDARY FENCING.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection-but appeal allowed as reported to 19th September 2011 planning committee)</i>
21/02/2011	BI/11/00668/PLD	CDC	10 BURLOW CLOSE BIRDHAM CHICHESTER WEST SUSSEX. PO20 7ES	SHED.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	CERTIFICATE REFUSED (PLANNING PERMISSION REQUIRED)
21/02/2011	BO/11/00376/DOM	CDC	WHITEWALLS, 2 ELM PARK, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8PD	REPLACEMENT GARAGE, CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE TO HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION WITH LINK TO MAIN DWELLING. ALTERATIONS TO THE ROOF INCLUDING DORMER TO SOUTH ELEVATION AND CHANGES TO FENESTRATION.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suitable condition be imposed to ensure the retention of the existing boundary planting. 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(condition requested by CHC not included)</i>
22/02/2011	BI/11/00299/FUL	CDC	LANSDALE MARINE, PREMIER BUSINESS PARK, BIRDHAM ROAD, BIRDHAM,	REPLACEMENT OF GARAGE LOST IN PLANNING APPLICATION BI/07/02832/FUL WITH NEW	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			WEST SUSSEX PO20 7BU	GARAGE TO REAR OF SITE FOR THE ANCILLARY STORAGE AND/OR VALETING OF CARS AND BOATS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building to be dark green or dark brown (including walls, roof and up and over door); • Hedgerow planting to be carried out in the first available planting season following completion of the building and to comprise a suitable native species mix including some Holly (consultation with the Conservancy would be welcomed). • A suitable condition be imposed to control the use. 	<i>by CHC included)</i>
22/02/2011	WE/11/00117/FUL	CDC	JUBILEE WOOD, HAMBROOK HILL NORTH, HAMBROOK,	ERECTION OF POLE BARN.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
22/02/2011	FB/11/00550/TPA	CDC	LAND AT PUMPING STATION, MILL LANE, FISHBOURNE, WEST SUSSEX	REDUCE HEIGHT BY 2M AND WIDTH (ALL ROUND) BY 2M ON 1 NO. ASH TREE (T1) SUBJECT TO FB/11/00002/TPO.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
24/02/2011	WI/11/00604/TCA	CDC	WAKESWAY, THE STREET, ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7AN	NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO REDUCE HEIGHT TO 4M ON 1 NO. MONTEREY CYPRESS (MACROCARPA) TREE (T1).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	NO TPO MADE
24/02/2011	WI/11/00639/TCA	CDC	OLD HAVEN, THE STREET, ITCHENOR, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7AN	NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO FELL 2 NO. BAY TREES (T2 AND T3) AND 1 NO. PITTISPORUM (T4).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends that a TPO is considered on the 2 Bay trees (T2 and T3), and that a suitable native tree is planted to replace the Pittisporum (T4). If the Council is not minded to make a TPO, then we would ask for suitable replacements for the 2 Bay trees.	NO TPO MADE (NO 'INFORMATIVE' RE. REPLACEMENTS INCLUDED)
25/02/2011	BO/11/00760/FUL	CDC	BROOKS GREEN FARM, BROOKS LANE,	VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 2 AND 3 OF PLANNING	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			BOSHAM, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8JY	PERMISSION BO/10/03126/FUL TO PERMIT THE STORAGE OF CLASSIC CARS IN THE FORMER CONFERENCE AREA, WITH THE ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS TO THE BUILDINGS.		
25/02/2011	BO/11/00688/DOM	CDC	CLOUDY BAY, SHORE ROAD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8QL	CONSENT TO RELOCATE AN AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF THE HOUSE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
25/02/2011	BI/11/00755/FUL	CDC	AUTO BARN, BIRDHAM ROAD, BIRDHAM, CHICHESTER, PO20 7BX	ERECTION OF COVERED PARKING FOR CAR PREPARATION	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/samples of materials and finishes be agreed by condition; • Existing hedge be retained and managed and proposed new hedge be implemented and managed (as shown on the plans); and • Any external lighting be agreed in writing with the LPA, to prevent light spillage outside the property and into the surrounding countryside and AONB. 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>
28/02/2011	APP/10/00953	HBC	BOATYARD, MARINE WALK, HAYLING ISLAND PO11 9PG	CONSTRUCTION OF SEA DEFENCE WORKS (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the applicant relinquishes two mud berths by way of habitat compensation. 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
28/02/2011	SB/11/00192/DOM	CDC	2 KINGS COURT, SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8FD	SINGLE-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND INFILLING OF EXISTING PORCH AT FRONT.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
01/03/2011	SB/11/00606/FUL	CDC	GLEBE FARM, MAIN ROAD, SOUTHBOURNE, HAMPSHIRE	PROPOSED ACCESS AND HARDSTANDING TO SERVE PERMITTED AGRICULTURAL BARN.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
01/03/2011	BO/10/05698/FUL	CDC	1 CHURCH MEADOW, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8HW	VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 (APPROVED PLANS) ON PLANNING PERMISSION BO/10/02988/FUL TO ALLOW EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO THE DESIGN OF PLOT 2 TO INCLUDE CAR PORT EXTENSION, COVERED VERANDAS TO GROUND FLOOR AND AMENDMENTS TO WINDOWS, DOORS AND GABLE WALL TREATMENTS.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
03/03/2011	APP/11/00019	HBC	46 LANGSTONE ROAD, HAVANT, PO9 1RF	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND GARAGE, CONSTRUCTION OF 1NO. REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY 4 BED DETACHED HOUSE, SINGLE STOREY ANNEX AND CARPORT WITH STORE. (REVISED APPLICATION.)	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
04/03/2011	BO/11/00814/DOM	CDC	OLD PARK FARM, OLD PARK LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8EX.	EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING RESIDENTIAL ANNEX	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/samples of materials to be agreed in writing, including the finished colour of the proposed windows and doors; • A condition or Section 106 agreement requiring that the granary building is only used as ancillary accommodation to the main residential use of Old Park Farmhouse. 	REFUSED (**conflict**)
07/03/2011	SB/11/00882/LBC	CDC	BAYTREES, PRINSTED LANE, PRINSTED, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8HT	ERECTION OF A TWO-STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS, WHICH INCLUDE: REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING STAIRCASES, EN-SUITE AND DORMER. REMOVAL OF THE OUTBUILDING CONTAINING THE BOILER AND A SECTION OF REAR WALL AT THE NORTH EAST CORNER (AMENDMENT TO 10/00244/LBC).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
07/03/2011	SB/11/00723/DOM & SB/11/00714/LBC	CDC	MERE COTTAGE, MAIN ROAD, NUTBOURNE, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8RT	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING 2-STOREY FRONT AND 1-STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS (BUILT WITHOUT PLANNING PERMISSION) AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW 1	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ridge height or length of proposed garage be reduced; 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included but ridge height / length</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
				1/2-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE GARAGE AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN OAK FRAMED SINGLE GARAGE, NEW ACCESS AND DRIVEWAY.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed hedgerow planting to north side of garage be extended along western boundary to the rear of the proposed garage and to be a suitable native species typical of the AONB; Remaining hedgerow to east of proposed access driveway be retained and managed; Schedule/samples of materials to be agreed prior to construction. 	<i>not reduced)</i>
07/03/2011	WW/11/00741/FUL	CDC	CHAMBON, ROOKWOOD ROAD, WEST WITTERING, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 8LT	PROPOSED DWELLING.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	NOT DETERMINED - APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION ALLOWED
08/03/2011	SB/11/00090/FUL (A)	CDC	THORNHAM MARINA, THORNHAM LANE, SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8DD	REPLACE EXISTING PONTOONS WITH NEW PONTOONS AND NEW LAYOUT. REMOVAL OF 8 SWINGING MOORINGS.	<p>The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to the revised application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of the 8 swinging moorings be secured by suitable condition or legal agreement; Pontoon berths be restricted to the marina sides of the pontoons (i.e. the outer sides of the northernmost and southernmost pontoons to be kept clear); Works to be carried out outside the bird overwintering period (which runs from October to March inclusive) and in accordance with the submitted details and method statement. 	<p>APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS</p> <p><i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i></p>
11/03/2011	APP/11/00166	HBC	10 WITTERING ROAD,	CONSTRUCTION OF NEW	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the	REFUSED

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			HAYLING ISLAND, HANTS, PO11 9SP	EXTERNAL STAIRCASE TO EXISTING FLAT ROOF TO REAR ELEVATION AND NEW BALCONY RAIL AND DECKING.	Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A natural or dark stain finish for the proposed timber slat staircase • A top rail and uprights of a suitable matt finish to break up the visual impact of the proposed glass balcony balustrade. 	<i>(on grounds of overlooking)</i>
11/03/2011	APP/11/00205	HBC	TIDES REACH, 5 THE FISHERMANS, EMSWORTH, PO10 7BS	CONSTRUCTION OF A GLAZED WALKWAY BETWEEN HOUSE AND GARAGE. INSERTION OF NEW WINDOW TO WEST ELEVATION AND EAST ELEVATION.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
11/03/2011	SB/11/00949/OUT	CDC	112 MAIN ROAD, SOUTHBOURNE, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8AY	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING, ASSOCIATED OUTBUILDINGS, 3 NO. GLASSHOUSES. ERECTION OF 42 NO. 2 AND 3 BEDROOM DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED OUTBUILDINGS, PARKING AND ACCESS WITH SOME MATTERS RESERVED.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection)</i>
14/03/2011	E/10/05573/FUL	CDC	MARSH FARM BARN, DROVE LANE, EARNLEY, PO20 7JW	RETENTION OF AN AGRICULTURAL METAL SHED SITES ON AGRICULTURAL LAND.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
15/03/2011	BI/11/00632/DOM	CDC	MILE COTTAGE, MAIN ROAD, BIRDHAM,	SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this	REFUSED

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
			CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO20 7BX		application.	<i>(supported our objection)</i>
15/03/2011	TG/11/00738/FUL	CDC	LAND EAST OF LOWER HAM FARM, CHURCH LANE, OIVING, WEST SUSSEX	PROPOSED 5MWp SOLAR ENERGY FARM TO INCLUDE INSTALLATION OF SOLAR PANELS, WITH ON SITE PLANT AND MACHINERY, ACCESS TRACKS, SECURITY FENCING AND LANDSCAPING ETC	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no comments to make on this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
16/03/2011	BI/10/05592/FUL	CDC	ST JAMES CHURCH CHURCH LANE BIRDHAM WEST SUSSEX	TWO-STOREY LINKED EXTENSION	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples of materials be agreed in writing prior to construction; (to include reclaimed tiles for the extension roof); • Retention of soft landscaping and replacement of Maple with a suitable native tree; typical of the AONB; • Extension to remain ancillary to the Church for community uses such as those set out in the statement of need. 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>
17/03/2011	BO/11/01069/DOM	CDC	HOOK FARM, HOOK LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8EY	ERECTION OF CONSERVATORY.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak frame to be left to weather naturally or finished in a suitably muted paint or stain, to reduce the visual impact of the conservatory as viewed across the Harbour from the foreshore at Dell Quay. 	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS <i>(conditions requested by CHC included)</i>

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
17/03/2011	BO/11/00765/DOM	CDC	HOVE TO, SMUGGLERS LANE, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX. PO18 8QP	REMOVAL OF EXISTING ROOF FROM CHALET STYLE BUNGALOW, CONSTRUCTION OF FIRST FLOOR AND REPLACEMENT ROOF ABOVE. EXTENSION TO SWIMMING POOL TO BE RETAINED WITHIN EXISTING DECKED AREA.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy recommends refusal of this application.	REFUSED <i>(supported our objection)</i> APPEAL DECISION FOR LATER APPLICATION INCLUDED IN LAST ITEM OF AGENDA
22/03/2011	APP/11/00147	HBC	36 WITTERING ROAD, HAYLING ISLAND, PO11 9SP	APPLICATION TO VARY CONDITIONS 2 AND 3 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 07/71495/001 RELATING TO USE OF THE LODGE AS SHORT TERM ACCOMMODATION FOR OCCUPANTS OTHER THAN NAMED RESIDENT.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
22/03/2011	APP/11/00260	HBC	4B KINGS TERRACE, EMSWORTH, PO10 7AA	SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION. REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FLAT ROOF WITH PITCHED ROOF (EAST ELEVATION).	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
22/03/2011	APP/11/00256	HBC	28 BEACON SQUARE EMSWORTH PO10 7HU	EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING PERMISSION 08/54631/006 RELATING TO OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF A SINGLE DWELLING HOUSE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
23/03/2011	APP/11/00271	HBC	2 BARN CLOSE, EMSWORTH, PO10 7LJ	TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Reports back for information: January, February and March 2011

Date	Application No	L/A	Site	Application Details	Recommendation	L/A Decision
23/03/2011	APP/11/00238	HBC	20 SOUTH STREET, EMSWORTH, PO10 7EH	DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT OF DILAPIDATED SOUTH WALL BOUNDARY.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
24/03/2011	BO/11/00724/PLD	CDC	1 CHANDLER COTTAGES, SHORE ROAD, BOSHAM, PO18 8HZ	REPLACEMENT OF ALUMINIUM PATIO DOORS WITH WOODEN FRENCH WINDOWS TO REAR OF PROPERTY.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	CERTIFICATE GRANTED
24/03/2011	BO/11/01165/DOM	CDC	10 WESTWARD CLOSE, BOSHAM, PO18 8QX	SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT OF HOUSE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
29/03/2011	WI/11/01269/TCA	CDC	OLDFIELD HOUSE, ITCHENOR ROAD, WEST ITCHENOR, PO20 7AB	NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO FELL 1 NO. SYCAMORE TREE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	NO TPO MADE
30/03/2011	SB/11/00866/DOM	CDC	3 KINGS COURT, EMSWORTH, HAMPSHIRE, PO10 8FD	TWO-STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application, but asks that the following matters be negotiated if possible:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials and finishes to match existing building. 	REFUSED (**conflict**)
30/03/2011	BO/11/01159/FUL	CDC	MALLARDS, WINDMILL FIELD, BOSHAM, CHICHESTER, WEST SUSSEX, PO18 8LH	VARY CONDITION 3 OF PREVIOUS PERMISSION BO/10/05217/FUL.	The Local Planning Authority is advised that the Conservancy has no objection to this application.	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS COMMENTED ON IN 3-MONTH PERIOD: 91

NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS WHERE THERE WAS NO SIGNIFICANT CONFLICT BETWEEN OUR RECOMMENDATION AND THE COUNCIL'S DECISION: 87 (95.6%)

