

## CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING

HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6 APRIL 2016 AT 5.30PM

- PRESENT : Councillors Keyworth, Kilby (Chairman) and Plowman
- EX OFFICIO : Deputy Mayor (Councillor Tupper)
- IN ATTENDANCE : Planning Adviser and Mayoral/Administrative Assistant
- ALSO PRESENT : Councillors Apel and Sharp
- APOLOGIES : The Mayor (Councillor Budge)  
Councillors Dempster, Dignum, M Evans and P Evans
- ABSENT : Councillor Joy

#### 95 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2016 having been printed and circulated were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### 96 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE IN MATTERS ON THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING

Councillors Kilby and Plowman declared a Personal Interest as members of Chichester District Council and Councillors Keyworth, Kilby and Plowman declared a Personal Interest as members of the Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

#### 97 PLANNING CONTRAVENTIONS

The Planning Adviser reported on the following unauthorised signage:

- (i) Pizza Hut, Portfield - awaiting the outcome of a planning appeal
- (ii) Entertainment Exchange, South Street - the District Council had issued enforcement proceedings.

RESOLVED to note the current situation.

#### 98 WHITEHOUSE FARM - UPDATE ON MASTER PLAN AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION

The Planning Adviser had prepared a report which was appended to the agenda and he briefed the Committee with the aid of a visual presentation. A discussion took place and the Committee RESOLVED:

To raise a **strong objection** on the grounds that:

- (i) No development should be permitted for Phase 1 of the development until a southern access route has been identified and agreed.

- (ii) The proposed access route for construction vehicles for Phase 1 of the development should be from the southern access. This would avoid the unacceptable level of traffic congestion, pollution and highway safety hazard (particularly in view of the number of schools likely to be affected) resulting from the proposed routing via Orchard Street and St Paul's Road.
- (iii) The relevant Highway Authorities have responded to the amendment and the City Council has had an opportunity to assess their comments.
- (iv) The Environment Agency has responded to the need for an on-site waste water disposal works in view of the proposed improvements to the Tangmere plant.
- (v) No cohesive cycling provision has been made to integrate safe cycle ways into the City.
- (vi) No details or justification have been provided of the proposed partial closure of Brandy Hole Lane.

99 STREET NAMING AND NUMBERING PROPOSAL - TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS

The Planning Adviser said that street naming requests had been received via the Property Manager from West Sussex County Council and Vanderbilt Homes respectively for the following :

- (i) Development off Orchard Street
- (ii) Former Car Park, The Woolstaplers

The Planning Adviser explained the background of the application and the Committee were asked to consider :

- (i) No's 1-4 Orchard Grove and
- (ii) No's 1-17 (excluding No. 13) Vesta

It was RESOLVED that the development at Orchard Street be named : No's 1-4 Orchard Grove and further RESOLVED that the former car park, The Woolstaplers, be named : No's 1-17 (excluding 13) Vesta. The Property Manager would be advised accordingly.

100 SADLERS WAREHOUSE, 29 LITTLE LONDON  
**Minute 85 refers**

The Planning Adviser explained that this item had been referred back to Committee for further clarification from the developers (Elberry Properties). It had appeared that when this matter was first considered by the Committee there had been a misunderstanding about the use of 29 Little London in the postal address. However, this had now been clarified and the Committee RESOLVED to support the proposal 1-5 Sadlers Warehouse, 29 Little London.

The Property Manager would be advised accordingly.

101 ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE PLANNING & CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

The Committee noted the report of the Planning Adviser appended to the agenda. Councillor Plowman wished to record thanks, on behalf of the Committee, for the comprehensive and informative work carried out by the Planning Adviser in support of the Committee and to thank him for all his good work. The Chairman re-iterated this.

## 102 REVIEW OF THE CITY COUNCIL'S PLANNING SERVICES

The Planning Adviser had prepared a report which was appended to the Agenda. He explained to the Committee his concerns about the inevitable increase in the level of workload to both members and him as the pace of new development within the City continued to rise. He added that in the interests of economy and efficiency, it was perhaps appropriate to review the planning service

He further explained that the current comprehensive procedure with every planning application, including listed building applications, advert and application for works to a tree (subject of a TPO/TCA) involved a great deal of preparation. Members remarked that the photographic presentation work provided by the Planning Adviser for each application was very beneficial but they appreciated the additional work involved.

The Planning Adviser sought the advice of the Committee as to whether it would be more efficient to prioritise the applications, so that only the truly contentious matters were considered.

One option would be to no longer routinely consider planning applications for household extensions (DOMS) which currently make up approximately 27% of the workload. A further option would be to no longer consider Tree applications (TCA's and TPA's) which largely duplicated the work of the District Council Tree Officer and made up approximately 18% of the workload.

The Planning Adviser said that one area which would still need to be considered was listed building applications, particularly those on domestic property (about 5% of workload).

The Committee noted that in the event that a Member, having considered the proposed plans, considered that a household application should be referred to Committee, they could still "Call in" the application by contacting the Planning Adviser. This would have to occur within a week of the publication of the Weekly List, otherwise the 21 day consultation period could not be met.

To assist with this, the Mayoral/Administrative Assistant said that the weekly planning list forwarded by the District Council from which she produced the City applications list could be forwarded to *all* members by email.

Nevertheless, in order that the impact of adopting the two options (as set out above) can be fully assessed, it is recommended these measures are initially adopted for a temporary period of one year and then reviewed.

Following discussion it was RECOMMENDED that the following proposals be referred to Full Council on 13 April 2016 :

- (i) to no longer routinely consider planning applications for household extensions (DOMS); and
- (ii) to no longer consider Tree applications (TCA's and TPA's).

It is further recommended that these measures are initially adopted for a temporary period of one year and then reviewed.

## 103 TREE PRESERVATION ORDER - LAND AT CATHEDRAL GREEN, WEST STREET, CHICHESTER (minute 67 refers)

The Committee RESOLVED to note that a Tree Preservation Order had been confirmed and that this would not now be challenged.

104 LAVANT PARISH COUNCIL - NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS - 7 WEEK PUBLIC CONSULTATION COMMENCING  
10 MARCH 2016 - CLOSING DATE FOR COMMENTS 28 APRIL 2016

The Committee RESOLVED to note the consultation period and commented in support of the Lavant Parish Council scheme.

105 MINUTES OF SUB-COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

The Minutes of the Planning Delegation Sub-Committee meeting held on 3 March and 21 March 2016 having been previously circulated were approved and adopted.

106 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Wednesday 4 May 2016

The meeting closed at 6.20pm.