

## **HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL**

At a meeting of the Planning Committee held on 1 December 2022

Present

Councillor Crellin (Chairman)

Councillors Milne, Linger, Weeks, Bowdell and Richardson (Standing Deputy)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Payter

### **27 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Fairhurst.

### **28 Minutes**

RESOLVED that:

- a The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 29 September 2022 be approved a true record and signed by the Chairman; and
- b The minutes of the Site Viewing Working Party held on 8 December 2022.

### **29 Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interests relating to matters on the agenda.

### **30 Matters to be Considered for Deferment or Site Viewing**

There were no matters to be considered for site viewing and deferment.

### **31 APP/21/01310 - Tournerbury Woods, Tournerbury Lane, Hayling Island**

(Viewed by the Site Viewing Working Party)

Proposal: Change of Use of land and woodland (retrospective) as a wedding and events venue, including retention of permanent ancillary buildings and structures, the erection of removable structures (including marquees and temporary facilities), and the use of the land as a campsite in association with events.

The Committee considered the written report and recommendation from the Head of Planning to refuse permission.

The Committee received supplementary information, circulated prior to the meeting, which included:

- 1) written deputations submitted by Professor Raper, Mr and Mrs Phillips, Mr Knappett, Ms Scott, Ms Barwick, Mr Ford, Ms Barnett, Ms French, Ms Meredith, the applicants' agent, County Councillor Quantrill, Councillor Payter, and Dr Austin, on behalf of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy;
- 2) Appendix I of the report which summarised representations received; and
- 3) updates to the submitted report.

The Committee was addressed by the following speakers:

- A. Mr Hicks, who highlighted the issues set out in the written submission objecting to the proposal submitted by Mrs Scott.  
  
(Mr Hicks failed to complete his deputation in the allotted time)
- B. Mrs Phillips read out the written submission submitted by her and her husband objecting to the proposal and referred to an additional incident, not set out in the written submission, which involved a speeding vehicle.
- C. Mr Knappett read out his written submission objecting to the proposal. When making his deputation Mr Knappett revised the number of potential guests referred to in the sixth paragraph of his written submission from 200 to 250;
- D. Professor Raper, who on behalf 40 objectors to this scheme highlighted the issues set out in his written submission objecting to the proposal.  
  
(Professor Raper failed to complete his deputation in the allotted time)
- E. Dr Austin, who behalf of the Chichester Harbour Conservancy highlighted the issues raised in his written submission objecting to the proposal and in particular drew attention to the following issues:
  - i. Natural England believed their assessment covered the SSSI;
  - ii. Natural England considered that breeding birds were not a designated feature of the SSSI and was not therefore closely considered by Natural England in their response to the application;
  - iii. the Natural England review did not consider the planning application under consideration by this Committee and was a standalone review;

- iv. argued that the proposal would not have a limited impact on the ANOB and the effects on the ANOB had been downplayed; and
- v. requested the Council to issue a Stop Notice, if it was minded to refuse the application;

In response to a question from a Member of the Committee, Dr Austin advised that the impact of the proposal needed to consider the satellite images of site and the long term impact of the proposal on the wood. He advised that he would prefer not to have the management of the wood dependent upon profits.

F Mr Morris, who on behalf of the applicants, highlighted the issues raised in his written submission supporting the proposal. He requested the Committee to defer consideration of this application, if it was minded to refuse permission. He also addressed the following issues raised by the representations and other deputees:

- The application was for the change of use of the land.
- The concerns raised over the application could be resolved via mitigation measures; further discussions on these measures should be held before a decision was made.
- The track was not a public highway and could accommodate passing areas. The track was better than other similar access tracks in the Borough.
- His clients had a right of access over the track.
- His clients would prefer not to use the track through the farm and would like to use an alternative route to and from the application site. However, the conditions attached to the use of the alternative route would need to be acceptable to his clients.
- The presence of the monument had been known for some time.
- A number of the issues raised by the objectors did relate to Tournerbury Farm and its uses.
- Natural England had submitted a fully up to date assessment which covered the whole of the wood.
- The Committee was required to consider the application as it stood and should not consider what might happen in the future.
- The Committee should determine the application on what had been submitted and impose such controls as considered necessary by condition or other appropriate methods.

In response to questions raised by Members of the Committee, Mr Morris:

- explained methods that could be used to monitor the use of the application site with reference to systems used by other nearby event venues.
- confirmed that the events would be self-managed and modified, if deemed necessary
- he was not aware of an individual meeting between Natural England and the Chichester Harbour Conservancy. However, he advised that discussions had been held with Natural England.

G. Ms Meredith, who highlighted the issues raised in her written submission supporting the proposal

H. County Councillor Quantrill, who highlighted the issues raised in his written submission supporting the proposal emphasising that the application met the County Council's and Council's strategies relating to economic growth in the Borough.

In response to a question raised by a member of the Committee, County Councillor Quantrill advised that his calculation of the multiplier effect of the proposal was based on Positive Economics by Lipsey.

I. Councillor Payter, who supported the proposal for the following reasons:

- a. the proposal complied with the Council's Regeneration Strategy in terms of sustainability;
- b. The use of the venue for the proposed events had proved to be a success;
- c. The applicants had a good record of ecological management;
- d. Other businesses profited from the use of the venue for wedding events;
- e. The economic, environmental and social benefits of the proposal outweighed the objections raised;
- f. This was opportunity to control the use of the site;
- g. The proposal did not compete with other wedding event businesses operating in the area;
- h. There was overwhelming support for this application;

- i. the terms and conditions proposed by the owners of the farm were not acceptable to the applicants. The issues concerning the access should be a matter to be decided by the parties involved and should not be the concern of the Council; and
- j. If the Committee was not minded to permit this application, the Committee should defer consideration to find ways of overcoming the objections raised.

In response to a question raised by a member of the Committee, Councillor Payer advised that she last visited the site approximately two months ago and travelled to the site in a shared taxi.

In response to the deputations, the Officers advised the Committee of the options available to the Committee.

In response to questions raised by members of the Committee, the officers advised that

- the planning process could not resolve the access issue as the alternative access was not owned by the applicants. The use of the alternative route could only be resolved via discussion between the applicants and the owners of the alternative access; and
- irrespective of what decision was made by the Committee, there was a site management agreement with Natural England which ensured that there would be ongoing dialogue and reviews relating to the management of the wood.

The debate revealed that there was no clear majority in favour or against the proposal with differences expressed over:

1. the ecological impact of the proposal;
2. the impact of the proposal on the farm and the residents of properties in close proximity to the track;
3. whether the benefits of the proposal outweighed its disbenefits;
4. the burden which would be placed on the farm owner if the application was granted; and
5. the suitability of the track to accommodate the proposal

It was the majority opinion of the Committee that the most appropriate way forward was defer consideration of this application to see if the concerns raised could be overcome by further discussions.

RESOLVED that consideration of this application be deferred to enable the officers to discuss with the applicants ways of addressing the issues set out below

Issues to be considered:

- More positive details on the proposed monitoring and recording of visitors
- The feasibility of using an alternative route
- A reduction in the volume of traffic likely to be generated by the proposal

**The meeting commenced at 5.01 pm and concluded at 7.06 pm**

.....

**Chairman**