

## Recommendation Preview

6/8/13 Week Target:  
Date Publicity Expires:  
Extension of Time: Yes/No  
CIL under 100m<sup>2</sup>: Yes/No

**Application:** BX/16/01196/FUL

**Recommendation:** REFUSE

**Decision Type:** Committee Decision

1) Insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the existing employment site has been sufficiently marketed for employment purposes and is no longer required and is unlikely to be re-used or redeveloped for Business (B1-B8) or similar uses. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the local economy by virtue of the unjustified loss of existing employment land contrary to the Core Principles and Paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 of the NPPF and policies 3 and 26 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029.

2) The proposal would result in the development of a new dwelling in the countryside without any special justification to demonstrate that the proposal requires a countryside location and meets any essential, small scale and local need that cannot be met within a designated settlement boundary. The proposal therefore constitutes an unsustainable and inappropriate form of development that fails to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding rural area and to maintain the individual identity of the settlement. The proposal is therefore contrary to Sections 6 and 7 generally of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies 1, 2, 33, 45 and 48 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029.

3) The proposed development would result in the creation of tourist accommodation in the countryside and insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would require a countryside location and cannot be accommodated elsewhere, or that the proposal supports the objectives of rural regeneration/diversification. As such the proposal would be contrary to policies 1, 2, 30 and 48 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029 and paragraphs 17 and sections 3 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4) The proposed dwelling by virtue of its prominent siting and proximity to the south site boundary and its size and scale and the associated detached 1.5 storey garage with the domestic dormer window, would introduce a significant level of built form on an otherwise unassuming site. It would appear intrusive and harmful to the character of the surrounding area, particularly when viewed from the adjacent public footpaths and from the Conservation Area. In addition the tourism lets, by reason of their height, scale and form, would further contribute to the increase in built form in the site and the visual prominence in the surrounding area. As such the proposal would fail to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, the historic environment, or integrate the new development sensitively into the natural and built environment which would as a result be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the locality. The proposal would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 17, 56, 58, 60 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies 1, 33, 47 and 48 of the Chichester Local Plan Key Policies 2014-2029.

5) INFORMATIVE

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, it has not been possible to resolve them. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.



**PROCEDURES CHECK LIST**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Compliance with Development Plan                        | Yes/No                                       |
| Representations considered                              | None received /Reps considered               |
| Statutory Consultee Objection                           | Yes/No                                       |
| Human Rights considered                                 | Yes/No/N/A                                   |
| Parish Council  | None received/Objection/No Objection/Comment |
| Red Card  | Yes/No                                       |
| Has Publicity expired? (press, neighbours, site notice) | Yes/No                                       |

**IF NOT, DO NOT DETERMINE BEFORE** \_\_\_\_\_

---

**OFFICER CHECK**

**SIGN**

**DATE**

CASE OFFICER

\_\_\_\_\_

DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

\_\_\_\_\_

**DECISION ISSUED**

\_\_\_\_\_

---

(Admin to move imaged plans from PENDING CONSIDERATION to DECISION)