

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 25TH JULY 2023**  
**ADDENDUM REPORT**

**Subject** Hybrid application for ‘expansion of Canterbury Business Park comprising detailed proposals for 11,900 sqm winery with associated parking and landscaping; and outline proposals for all matters reserved except access for up to 8,000 sqm of warehousing’ reference CA/22/02055 at Land South West of Canterbury Business Park, Coldharbour Lane, CT4 5HL.

**Head of Service** Simon Thomas, Planning and Health

The purpose of this addendum is to clarify two matters following the publication of the committee report on Monday 17th July and to make the Planning Committee aware of the additional representations received.

EIA Development

The applicant submitted an Environmental Statement with the application and so under the 2017 Regulations, the application is classified as an Environmental Impact Assessment application and must be treated as such by the local planning authority.

The Environmental Statement submitted with the planning application provides an adequate assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed development. The Council carried out consultation by means of letters to neighbouring occupiers, a site notice posted at the site and a notice in the press. The consultation ran between 17 November 2022 to 19 December 2022.

The committee report assesses the environmental impacts of the development. It is concluded that the environmental effects of the development would not be such that planning permission should not be granted.

AONB - scope for developing outside of the designated area

As set out in the committee report, the applicant explored the possibility of locating the Chapel Down winery and storage functions outside of the AONB. I concluded that the assessment was robust and demonstrated that the development cannot be located on sites outside of the AONB in the Canterbury District.

The Court of Appeal decision in *Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Knight Developments Ltd v Wealden District Council* has confirmed that the extent of the area to be considered for alternative sites is a matter for the LPA, depending on the circumstances.

Paragraph 21 of the main Planning Committee report states that the applicant has also considered sites outside of the Canterbury District. These were not assessed as they fell outside of the jurisdiction of this Local Planning Authority. However, I have reviewed the

methodology used by the applicant when considering the alternative sites outside of the Canterbury District and consider it to be a reasoned, proportionate and robust approach to take. The applicant in total considered 89 sites across 7 districts that cover the chalk seam (Canterbury, Dover, Folkestone, Ashford, Sittingbourne, Faversham and Maidstone).

As such, Officers consider that alternative sites outside of the AONB have been adequately assessed in regard to the cost of and scope for developing outside the designated area. As such I am of the opinion that the proposed development satisfactorily meets the requirements of paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Further representations received

Since the main report was published, a further 10 representations have been received from local vineyard operators, who are currently customers of Defined Wines, in support of the planning application. These representations explain the benefit of the additional storage facilities proposed by Defined Wines, which they say would support the intended expansion of growing operations. One of those making representations says that in the past, they have had to transport grapes to production and storage facilities in West Sussex. Another says that their contract with Defined Wines has meant that they could terminate their previous contract with a production facility in Hampshire and reduce their carbon footprint.

The representations also refer to the employment benefits for the local area associated with the expansion of their businesses.

The economic benefits of the development are addressed and fully appraised within the main report.

An additional letter of support has also been received, which says that the proposals would support business growth within the UK and would allow the UK to become more self-sufficient.

Nine representations have been received, objecting to the proposed development. The representations make the following points:

- The proposal is not within the current adopted Local Plan and the draft Local Plan is still under review
- There are no 'exceptional circumstances'
- Significant impact on biodiversity, noise, lighting, the listed building and loss of farmland

A further representation has also been submitted by CPRE (The Campaign to Protect Rural England), which says the consultation carried out on the application was inadequate and that the Council has failed to comply with paragraphs 176 and 177 of the NPPF, harm to the AONB and AHLV, loss of agricultural land, light pollution, impact on heritage assets, impact on ecology, increase in traffic and pollution. The CPRE also say that limited weight should be given to the site's inclusion within the Regulation 18 version of the emerging Local Plan.