



## CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

### ADVISER'S REPORT FOR THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE AT 5.30PM ON 13 DECEMBER 2017

- (i) CC/17/03117/FUL  
Land West Of Frederick Road Chichester West Sussex  
Erection of 25 no. dwellings with the associated vehicular and pedestrian access, parking and secure cycle storage, landscaping and open space.

#### **Introduction and Site Description**

It is proposed to develop this greenfield site at Clay Lane for residential use. The site is adjacent to residential properties to the east, bounded by a railway line to the south, the A27 to the west, and Clay Lane to the north. The area has a rural character and is on the eastern edge of Chichester, outside of the settlement boundary. 25 properties are proposed, including houses and flats.

#### **Main Considerations**

The main considerations in relation to this development are:

- Planning policy
- Noise impact
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Layout, design and appearance

The site is outside of the settlement area where development is encouraged to be concentrated, and is not allocated for housing. The site is a green field site within the countryside and does not therefore accord with policy 2, development and settlement hierarchy. However the site is adjacent to residential properties to the east, and is bounded by a railway line to the south, the A27 to the west, and Clay Lane to the north.

The proposal is for 25 dwellings and features a mix of dwelling types and affordable homes; 28% affordable homes, and a mix of 15 no. 1-2 bed roomed units (60%), 7 no. 3 bed roomed units (28%) and 3 no. 4 bed roomed units (12%). Fewer 1 or 2 bed roomed properties (around 35%) and more larger units (50% 3-bed and 15% 4-bed) would be a more preferable mix according to identified local requirements in the SHMA. In addition 30% affordable housing is usually required for developments of this size, however the applicant offers a financial contribution for offsite provision for the deficit. An area of informal open space is offered in front of the apartment buildings. To the rear of these buildings the noise renders the outdoor space unsuitable for amenity use, and a parking court is therefore provided in this location. Such a design may be associated with anti-social behaviour, particularly as overlooking of this area will be reduced as windows on the facades overlooking the parking court are minimized and reduced in size in order to reduce the noise impact on residents within the apartment buildings which acts as a noise barrier for the rest of the site. This does not accord with policy 33 on residential development.

The maximum desirable outdoor daytime sound level for new development is 50dB LAeq, at which level the noise is likely to be moderately disturbing to most people; 55dB LAeq would be a significantly disturbing noise level to most people. Current noise levels across the site range from 61-76dB LAeq, significantly in excess of what would be an appropriate level.

To address the noise levels, a 1.8m fence would be erected around the site, and the two large 2.5 storey apartment buildings would be sited to the west of the site to provide screening to the properties on the rest of the site. However, in order to maintain acceptable internal noise levels within the flats, the windows would have to remain closed and alternative ventilation would be required. This is not considered to be an acceptable design solution and would not meet the standards for new housing development required by policy 33 of the Local Plan.

A mix of house types is provided on site; mainly detached chalet bungalows. The blocks of flats are three stories in height although the third storey is contained within the roof space. The character of the area is rural and it is clear travelling along this part of clay lane that the density of dwellings noticeably reduces travelling away from the settlement into the countryside. Whilst the detached dwellings proposed along the frontage respect the existing pattern of development to some degree, the large blocks of flats are not appropriate and create a more urban character, contrary to the requirements for new housing within policy 33 of the Local Plan.

## **Conclusion**

The layout of the proposal and the design and appearance of the buildings would be harmful to the character of the area. The amenity of the residents of the proposed blocks of flats would be unacceptably affected by noise.

**Recommendation: Objection on the grounds that the amenity of the residents of the proposed blocks of flats would be unacceptably affected by noise. The design and appearance of the buildings would be harmful to the character of the area.**

- (ii) CC/17/03060/OUT  
Land North Of Barnfield Drive East Of Graylingwell Hospital Barnfield Drive Chichester West Sussex  
A minor road to provide access between Phase 2 of the Westhampnett / North East Chichester Strategic Development Location (application ref: 16/03791/OUT) and the approved layout for Phase 4 of the Graylingwell Park Development.

## **Introduction and Site Description**

The application is a for outline permission to provide a vehicular link between phase 2 of the (outline) Westhampnett permission and phase 4 of the Graylingwell permission.

## **Main Considerations**

The application would provide vehicular connection between these two adjacent large scale residential developments, improving the accessibility and permeability of both developments.

Details of the junction would be provided through a reserved matters application and WSCC has indicated that there should be a north-south priority. This is shown within indicative plans for outline permission for the Westhampnett permission.

## **Conclusion**

The proposal would improve accessibility and permeability and is acceptable in principle. Further details would be required at reserved matters stage should the application be approved.

**Recommendation: No objection**

(iii) CC/17/03136/FUL

19 Southgate Chichester PO19 1ES

Formation of 9 no. dwellings through creation of 2nd floor and change of use of part of ground floor and 1st floor. Various external alterations including location increases in height of roof and changes to its form, 1st floor infill extension and the introduction of new and changes to existing door and window openings.

### **Introduction and Site Description**

This application relates to the former Argos building, which currently has A1 use over both ground and first floors. The site is a large, modern, retail building within the conservation area and secondary shop frontage area of Chichester city centre. The building is not listed but neighbouring properties including 16 – 18 Southgate to the immediate south of the site and number 24 Southgate to the north of the site are Grade II listed buildings. The adjoining unit to the north (within the same building) comprises “The Vestry” a popular drinking and dancing establishment which opens late into the night. The proposal is to create a second floor for residential use; part of the ground and first floor would change use to residential (from retail), and various external alterations including extensions, roof height changes and new fenestration.

Although it is not included in the description of development, the plans and details of the application also appear to request a change of use of the first floor from A1 use to “D1/D2/B1 use” with a separate “gym entrance” provided, and from A1 on the ground floor to A1/A2/A3.

### **Main considerations**

- Impact on the city centre/secondary shopping frontage area
- Residential amenity
- Impact upon the Conservation Area and the setting of the surrounding listed buildings

Policy 27 of the Local Plan provides that change of use from A1 to A2 or A3 use would be acceptable provided that no more than 75% of uses along the whole frontage are in non-retail uses. The current level is around 54%. However, the application site is a large, two-storey A1 unit; this is very rare in the historic city centre where units tend to be much smaller due to historic building patterns and constraints of historic building practices. The loss of a retail unit of this size restricts the type of retail store/goods which can be provided within the city centre, and this has consequences for the viability and vitality of the city centre where a wide range of goods should be available to meet the demands and expectations of shoppers and visitors.

The service yard area is proposed to be given over to car parking for 4 cars for the residential units. A servicing/loading bay would block these cars in (or out) when in use, creating conflict between the mix of uses proposed. Only a small service entrance to the rear remains to serve the A1 unit, and this is a winding route through corridors and internal doors, and adjacent to proposed residential units, reducing the suitability and functionality of the building as a commercial unit. Areas for restaurant ducting and plant are shown adjacent to proposed dwellings. The plant is also close to the windows of existing as well as proposed dwellings. The Vestry public house is located adjacent to the proposal site. Chichester has no night club and the Vestry is a popular alternative for drinking and dancing until late at night. This is unlikely to be compatible with adjacent residential use; noise complaints from new residents may impact the existing business. The proposal would thereby create numerous conflicts between existing and proposed uses.

The external appearance of the building has been influenced by features and materials from the existing building and the surrounding conservation area, and these are applied to the proposal to create a high quality residential appearance, however, the frontage to the townhouses will be within a service yard area with no opportunity for landscaping. The visual impact of the proposal would have little effect upon historic assets, however, the noise of the plant together with the proximity (20m back to back), extent and design of the residential development may impact the amenity of the existing residents to the south the of the site, who would look directly onto 3 storey dwellings, and second storey flats served by dormer windows extending around the flank elevation of the building including a corner infill which creates a ‘surrounding’ effect, overlooking from three angles.

The noise survey provided is insufficiently detailed. It records existing ambient external noise and predicts the impact from this on the proposed new dwellings. No internal noise measurements are taken, therefore potential noise through the party wall from the Vestry is not considered. Since the exact nature of the uses of the commercial parts of the building have not been specified, no assessment can be made of their potential impact on residents. No assessment can be made of plant noise, as specific plant is not specified. However, proximity to windows means that adverse effect is likely and mitigation such as acoustic enclosure is likely to be required (and may not be sufficient to protect the amenity of new or existing residents).

## **Conclusion**

The planning application would result in the loss of a large A1 unit, and the reduction in functionality of the commercial unit due to layout changes and siting alongside incompatible uses. The application requests a change of use to a number of uses, including A1, A2 or A3 on the ground floor and D1, D2 or B1 use on the first floor. Such a permission would leave the LPA unable to control the impacts of these various uses, or assess the suitability of the various uses which, if permitted, the applicant would be able to change between regardless of how appropriate the surrounding context may be in future. The uses proposed are incompatible with each other and with existing surrounding uses, and would result in unacceptable residential amenity for new and existing residents.

**Recommendation: Objection due to loss of a large A1 unit, loss of functionality of the commercial unit, incompatibility of residential use with existing and proposed surrounding uses, impact on amenity of existing residents of proposed residential development, commercial development and plant. If approved, the range of uses would effectively remove the use of most the building from appropriate planning control.**