West Itchenor Parish Council

Minutes of a Planning Meeting of the West Itchenor Parish Council held on Monday 12 October 2015 in The Itchenor Memorial Hall.

Present: Mr G Colbourne, Mr C Mead-Briggs, Mr A Spencer (Chairman) Mrs A Trevelyan

In attendance: Mrs C Smith (Clerk), Mr B Hull, Mr M Trundle (Henry Adams) Mr M Webb (Sunchalk), Mr P Caldwell (O'Neill) 20 members of public.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr Dunn and Cllr Watson.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.

None.

3. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING HELD ON 28 September 2015.

The Chairman called for the approval of the Minutes of the Planning Meeting held on 28 September 2015. These were **AGREED** and the Chairman duly signed the Minutes as being a true record of the meeting.

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

4.1 WI/15/02618/COU – Chichester Harbour Marine Park , The Street, Itchenor
Use of Units 1, 2 and 3 for Class B8 - Storage and distribution.

The Chairman invited Mr Hull (Henry Adams) to address the meeting.

Mr Hull stated that as agreed at the last meeting the additional information had been forwarded to the Clerk and this had dealt with the matters raised. He added that the Planning Officer had been impressed with the level of detail in the report. Mr Hull highlighted key areas of the report (See appendix 1). Mr Hull advised that the peak months for deliveries for O'Neill were actually March and April and not the busy summer months. He also highlighted the costs of running the boat yard. The site had been marketed internationally by the applicant but there had been no takers.

Mr Hull stated that he was well aware of the concerns of residents and the Parish Council and that the Parish Council may seek to have the application refused. He suggested that the Parish Council also had the option not to object to the application but to request that conditions be attached to the planning permission that would address the concerns raised.

Mr Hull advised that the application would be considered by the District Council's Planning Committee in November. He stated that he would be making a representation to the planning committee in which the following points would be made.

- It is in no-ones interest that the buildings remain empty
- The viability of the current boat repair business would be in jeopardy if the empty buildings are not let to other businesses. The current boat repair business could not afford to fund the empty buildings.
- The businesses wanting to lease the buildings should be allowed to relocate if they wanted to.
- The application complies with the Policies set out in the new Local Plan.
- It was in the best interests to have the buildings occupied quickly.

A number of questions were raised by Councillors.
The approach taken by Henry Adams to marketing the property, was this after an attempt to dispose of the manufacturing business?
Had Henry Adams only marketed the buildings without access to the waterfront? The brochure advertising the Units makes no reference to the waterfront access.

It was confirmed that Henry Adams had taken over the marketing of the site from September 2014 and that no reference was made to the waterfront access as the site had been rebranded Chichester Harbour Marine Park. Attempts to sell the business/site had been made by the applicant and this aspect had not been within Henry Adams remit.

The Parish Council had concerns about the marketing of the site and that no agents with International connections had been instructed. *Chichester District Council Local Plan 2014-2029 (CDCLP) Policy 26* was highlighted as consideration for the site and reference was made to *CDCLP Paragraph 16.8* that highlighted the importance of retaining the marine use - *"Given the limited opportunities for employment uses with direct access to water, particular scrutiny will be given to the marketing evidence for marine related employment sites with the aim of preserving these uses"*. There was surprise that Henry Adams had not sought to advertise the site within the marine industry.

Mr Hull stated that the applicant had undertaken conversations with other marine businesses. Henry Adams had been engaged to advertise the real estate and had not been involved in any other discussions.

It appeared that the detail of the traffic information for the proposed change of use had been taken from the existing traffic information from the warehouse in Midhurst. Were the buildings smaller either in square footage or in volume?
The square footage of the buildings was very similar, the units at the proposed site were probably higher.

Is there an expectation that with the higher volume of storage more product would be delivered and stored? With the increased storage it is anticipated that more product would be shipped directly to the customer. The purpose of moving back to the area was for convenience for employees, a more attractive rent and larger space. It was noted that O'Neill used to have a facility at Hilton Park in East Wittering.
It was noted that the offices at the proposed site would be three times larger than those currently in use at the Midhurst site. There are currently 20/25 employees at the Midhurst site, this may increase if the move to Itchenor takes place.

At the open day held in July many people had come away with the impression that the peak time for deliveries would be July/August – what has changed?
Mr Hull suggested that people had come away with the wrong impression, the summer product that was to be sold would arrive before Easter.

With regard to the traffic movements the question of the outgoing traffic movements was raised. Articulated HGVs delivering goods via containers would also need to leave the village thereby causing additional traffic movements.
Mr Hull did not accept this as the case.

There was further questioning about the traffic movements and that these were in excess of what residents were used to at the height of the Northshore business

being in operation. One of the units now being proposed for letting was put in specifically for the construction of the boat moulds. Once this had been set up there was a considerable reduction in articulated HGV movements.
Mr Hull suggested that there were still large boats coming into the site for repairs and maintenance.
Mr Miles Webb confirmed that when in use by Southerly Yachts there was about one articulated HGV vehicle per week arriving. He also mentioned that roughly one boat a week was made at the site and many of the boats went out from the site via the water.
It was clarified that for O'Neill the container deliveries would come in, be unloaded and then leave empty. The Parish Council suggested that this constituted two vehicle movements, one into the site and one out.

A query was raised about the figures quoted by Henry Adams in the supplementary report (2.3). It would appear that vehicle movements October to December were roughly equivalent to those experienced when Northshore was in operation. However, during the rest of the year deliveries would be at least twice or three times what had previously been experienced. These figures were also based on the existing premises used and did not include any element for future growth of the business.
Mr Hull stated that there would be no weekend deliveries.

The width of the road from the Barns to the service road to the site was highlighted. The Parish Council had been out and physically measured the road. There were three points where the road reached 5.5m but most of the road was significantly narrower. In addition there were no verges or lay-bys that could be used as passing places. How was it envisaged that articulated HGVs would be able to come in and out of the site safely?
Mr Hull stated that it had been possible to deliver boats and therefore this was not considered to be an issue. He also highlighted that West Sussex Highways had not considered that this was an issue.

Mr Hull was thanked for his contribution and Councillors expressed their views.

It was noted that there were a considerable number of objections to the application and that the Parish Council had an obligation to represent the views of the residents.
There was a concern about safety on the road. Every time an articulated HGV vehicle made a delivery there would be difficulties on the road. Articulated HGV trucks were not capable of reversing along the road as there wasn't sufficient room. Such vehicles were by their very nature wide and there was concern that they would further damage the edges of the road which were already in places crumbling.
There was concern about safety for pedestrians and cyclists using the road having no refuge if confronted by an articulated HGV along the road.

Reference was again made to CDCLP *paragraph 16.8* that accompanied *Policy 26*.
There was concern that the space had not been properly marketed as there was no reference to the waterside access in the marketing brochure.
There was concern that the existing site in Midhurst was smaller by volume and that the traffic generated was in peak months three times greater than had been experienced at the site in Itchenor. Added to this was the increase in traffic using the already busy A286 up to Chichester.

RESOLVED that the Parish Council would object to the application highlighting the issues raised.

Mr Hull, Mr Trundle, Mr Webb and Mr Caldwell then left the meeting.

4.2 **BO/14/03987/FULEIA - New Barn Farm, Old Park Lane, Bosham**
The installation of photovoltaic arrays for the generation of renewable energy and associated fencing and equipment.

It was noted that there had been an amendment to this application that had resulted in the site being roughly half the original size. Although it was noted that amendments had been made to the proposal in light of the objections that had been raised, the Councillors considered that the sensitivity of the landscaping had not changed.
Fundamentally, the site lay in the AONB and it was felt that the solar panels over time would change the nature of the land.

RESOLVED that the Parish Council continues its objection to the proposal.
West Itchenor Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds.
The application conflicts with NPPF paragraph 115 which states that "Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty."
The application also conflicts with Chichester Local Plan, Policy 43 which gives guidance on the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the AONB. The application is considered to be a major industrial development and does not comply with the requirement to reinforce and respond to, rather than detract from, the distinctive character and special qualities of the AONB.
The proposal would require the cessation of agricultural land management which is deemed to be an important component of the AONB.
West Itchenor Parish Council requests that permission for this application is therefore refused.

5. PLANNING DECISIONS
None

6. ENFORCEMENT ISSUES
It was acknowledged that there had been some information regarding the movement of the boat moulds at Northshore.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING
The next meeting is scheduled for Monday 2 November 2015.

Signature _____ Date: _____
Chairman