

**Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting of Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council  
held in the Chidham & Hambrook Village Hall on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2016 at 7.30pm**

**Present:** Cllr Linda Wilkinson (Chairman) Cllr Andy Collins  
Cllr Cliff Archer Cllr Ina Littlefield  
Cllr Jane Towers Cllr Jacky Sheppard  
Cllr Geoffrey Hyde

**In attendance:** The Clerk: Caroline Davison

**Apologies for absence:**

**001** All members of Planning Committee present.

**Declaration of Interests and Granting of Dispensations if any:**

**002** a) There were no declarations of interest  
b) There were no dispensation requests

**Open Forum**

**003** No matters were raised.

**Planning Applications**

**004 CH/16/03129/DOM**

40 The Avenue Hambrook Chidham PO18 8TY

Alterations to front entrance and single storey rear extension.

No objection to this planning application.

**005 CH/16/02894/FUL**

Plot J Pond Farm Newells Lane West Ashling

Variation of condition 2 of planning permission CH/12/00458/COU - to make the temporary permission permanent.

The Parish Council objected to this variation to planning permission as the conditions in the approval had not been met. In its view there had been little apparent effort to improve the visual appearance of the site or for the occupants to find alternative accommodation.

Even if the conditions for the approval of temporary planning permission had been met in full, it was noted that the Parish Council would not support a permanent residence at this site.

**006 CH/16/03121/PLD**

9 Broad Meadows Broad Road Nutbourne PO18 8SN

Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear infill extension, hip to gable alteration and formation of flat roofed dormer.

The Parish Council objected to this planning application as it considered the french windows and juliette balcony to be overpowering and excessively overlooked the neighbouring properties. In the Parish Council's opinion a smaller window would be more appropriate.

**007 CH/16/03210/DOM**

Waters Edge Cut Mill Chidham PO18 8PS  
Construction of an oak framed garage.

No objection to this planning application.

**008 CH/16/02898/PLD**

Waters Edge Cut Mill Chidham PO18 8PS  
Oak framed rear conservatory.

No objection to this planning application.

**009 CH/16/02187/FUL**

20 Pynham Crescent Hambrook Chichester West Sussex  
Proposed extension to the rear of Plot 20.

No objection to this planning application. The Parish Council commented however that there was some confusion with this application between the house number and the plot number which were different but not always correctly referenced in the documentation supporting the application.

**010 CH/16/03243/DOM**

Jovian Scant Road West Hambrook Chichester  
Ground and first floor extensions.

No objection to this planning application

**011 CH/16/02856/ADV**

St Wilfrid's Hospice  
Unit 1 Chidham Place Main Road Chidham  
2 no. non-illuminated fascia signs.

No objection to this planning application.

The Parish Council commented however that the non-illuminated signs had already been installed at the premises prior to planning permission being obtained and if these were changed for either reflective or illuminated signs then the Parish Council would oppose such a change.

**Planning Application SDNPA/16/04679/CM**

**012** The Parish Council considered its response to planning application SDNPA/16/04679/CM for the appraisal and production of oil incorporating the drilling of one side track well from the existing well (for appraisal), three new hydrocarbon wells and one water injection well and to allow the production of hydrocarbons from all four wells for a period of 20 years at Markwells Wood within the Stoughton Parish. Whilst Chidham & Hambrook Parish Council was not a statutory consultee for this application which was to be determined by the South Downs National Park Authority the

application was considered to be of local significance given the potential impact on the aquifers serving the towns and villages on the coastal plain.

The Parish Council strongly objected to the application for the following reasons:

#### **DRILLING AND EXTRACTING OIL**

- Insufficient information has been supplied about the activity of drilling horizontally for 1 km and no assessment offered of the possible impact
- UKOG has not conducted a 3D geological survey and has neglected to prove there are no risks in relation to drilling the proposed wells
- The proposal includes the use of acids and other chemicals which may pose significant risk to the environment should an accident or spillage occur.
- Not all the chemicals have been fully disclosed as part of the public consultation e.g the chemicals used in the 'drilling Mud' to lubricate the drill as it makes its way underground
- There has been little research into the toxicity of chemicals used in the acidisation process. The geology of the area ( chalk ) is naturally fractured and there is concern regarding the migration of chemicals to the aquifer through the drilling process or spillage

#### **WATER AND GROUND WATER**

- The ground water from this area flows south west towards Bedhampton Springs which are also supplied by other aquifers in the chalk. Portsmouth Water relies on these springs to supply water to thousands of homes and businesses across the area in Hampshire and West Sussex.
- Portsmouth Water have objected to the application in its current format as it does not identify all potentially significant effects that the proposed works may have on groundwater or how adverse effects would be mitigated.
- UKOG admits that 'potentially contaminative' chemicals will be stored and used on site, acids would be injected into horizontal wells, and the water injection well would 'involve drilling through the chalk, which could result in the loss of fluid circulating within the chalk'.
- Should the water in the aquifers become contaminated by any of these processes the impact on the environment could be long term or irreversible. The risks of such contamination to the water supply from an acid, chemical or oil spillage, however small are unacceptable.
- UKOG have made it clear that should a serious contamination occur they have no public liability insurance against such risks.

#### **TRAFFIC**

- The increase in Heavy Goods Vehicle movement ( 12 hours a day and Saturday a.m.) would be detrimental to the core purpose of the Park
- Such increases would pose risks to walkers, cyclists and horse riders who use the road frequently for recreation.
- Broad Walk, the proposed access road is too narrow to accommodate a car and HGV at the same time.
- The proposed traffic route to the site in Horndean ( Emsworth Common Road and then Whichers Gate and North) presents several traffic hazards, including a 7-ton weight limit and a 'blind' hump back bridge.

#### **LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL ASPECTS**

- The impact on the landscape will be considerable. The site will be worked 24 /7 with lighting used throughout the night during well testing and production phases. This will cause light pollution and have an adverse effect on local residents.

- The 37m high drill rig will be visible from several viewpoints locally and on the Downs.
- The 10m high flare stack would remain on site for up to 25 years causing a negative visual impact.

#### **NOISE AND VIBRATION**

- There will be industrial drilling rigs working at the site 24/7 : “the predicted noise levels at night may significantly exceed current levels of background noise on a calm night, but levels remain well within night time noise limits”. This is unacceptable in a quiet, tranquil area.

#### **WILDLIFE ,NATURE CONSERVATION and HERITAGE**

- There are likely to be adverse effects on bats due to excessive night time light spill. Three rare bat species , including Bechstein’s bat , have been sighted in the area.
- Vibrations of drilling and emissions from flaring gases will affect reptiles and disturb badgers and birds.
- There are minimal and inadequate proposals to mitigate the impact on wildlife.
- The impact on conservation is in direct conflict with the first core purpose of the National Park
- There are three Grade 2 listed buildings in close proximity ( less than 750m) from the site. Stansted Park Is 850 m to the South.

#### **CLIMATE CHANGE**

- This application is counter to the recently produced South Downs National Park Authority Climate Change Adaptation Plan which is clear in its aim to ‘seek to promote the conservation and sustainable use ( of land, water and living resources) and to ensure that these essential natural services are protected and enhanced now and for the future’
- The extraction and use of oil will contribute further to the rise in carbon emissions and make it more difficult to reach our legally binding climate change targets.

#### **OTHER**

- UKOG have not demonstrated, despite being required to do so, that there are exceptional circumstances for the proposal and that it is in the public interest.
- They have not explained why Markwell Woods is the most appropriate site compared to other sites located outside the National Park and why these have been discounted.
- If this application were passed it would set an unwelcome precedent for oil extraction in the National Park
- If UKOG are right in their prediction of 100bn barrels of oil beneath the South Downs we could be facing hundreds of oil wells stretching across the Downs.

#### **Planning Appeals**

**013** It was noted that there was likely to be an appeal in respect of the proposed development at Moola House but the Inspector was still awaiting documentation to progress this.

**014** 16/02071/FUL Land South of Kings Meadow, Broad Road, Hambrook.  
Revised house type on Plot 30 with attached single garage and drive, access onto Broad Road.

The Parish Council objected to the application and agreed to submit the following comments:

The Parish Council does not object to the house on Plot 30 having an attached garage rather than a separate detached garage or to the proposed access onto Broad Road from Plot 30, provided that

WSCC Highways Department is content with the proposed sightlines in both directions on Broad Road and other relevant aspects of highway safety are satisfied.

Those Broad Road residents whom the Parish Council has consulted have no objections to the proposed Broad Road access. The Parish Council recognises that there are no north-facing windows on either the house or the proposed attached garage.

However, the Parish Council objects to the application however because it is concerned that the application does not comply with the judgement of the Appeal Inspector, who ruled that no part of the building on Plot 30 should be closer to 1 Kings Meadow than 16.5m. It seems to the Council that, if the application were to be approved, it would be flying in the face of the Inspector's ruling and the outcome would constitute an unwelcome precedent.

If, in the event, the District Council rules in favour of the applicant, the Parish Council asks that a Condition be applied such that neither the extension of the attached garage vertically or horizontally nor the installation of any north-facing windows would be permitted.

**Date of Next Meeting**

**015** The next Planning Meeting will be held on Tuesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 at 7.30pm.

The Meeting closed at 9.20pm.

---

Chairman