



The Council House · North Street · Chichester · West Sussex · PO19 1LQ
Tel : 01243 788502 · Fax : 01243 773022
Email : clerk@chichestercity.gov.uk · Website : www.chichestercity.gov.uk

Town Clerk : R Duggua RD BA (Hons)

**YOUR ATTENDANCE IS REQUESTED AT A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER
ON WEDNESDAY 22 MAY 2019 AT 5.30PM**

Town Clerk

A G E N D A

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN
2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN
3. TO DETERMINE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN MEMBERSHIP OF SUB-COMMITTEE NAMELY: PLANNING DELEGATION SUB-COMMITTEE
4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
5. MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE HELD ON 3 APRIL 2019
(*Copy previously circulated*)
6. UPDATE FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES
Please note that any actions arising from the previous Minutes are included on the Agenda
7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE IN MATTERS ON THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING
8. ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE APRIL 2018 TO MARCH 2019
Planning Adviser's report (*attached*)
9. PLANNING TRAINING – 21 MAY 2019 (5.30PM-7PM) - FEEDBACK
10. REPORT ON COMMITTEE PROCEDURE
Planning Adviser's report (*attached*)
11. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Lists 17, 18 and 19 (extracts)

Planning Adviser's reports (*attached*)

Cont'd.....

12. STREET NAMING AND NUMBERING
TO RE-CONSIDER AN APPLICATION RECEIVED FROM ELBERRY PROPERTIES
LIMITED – THREE NEW DETACHED HOUSES
(Minute 142 refers)

This item was previously considered by the Planning and Conservation Committee at their meeting on 4 April 2019 when it was RESOLVED not to support the omission of the street number in the house naming for Plots 1 and 2. An appeal against the decision has been received from the developer.

13. REVIEW OF COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE
(copy attached)

14. CLIMATE CHANGE
(Council Minute 52 and 53 refers)

NOTICE OF MOTION (1) FROM COUNCILLOR SHARP

The Mayor asked Councillor Sharp to introduce the Notice of Motion.

In light of the incredible success of the Blue Planet series in raising awareness of the dangers of single-use plastic, this Council:

1. Thanks and congratulations to the City Council staff on their use of real glasses and crockery in City Council functions and meetings.
2. Supports and looks into the feasibility of joining the “Refill” Scheme that West Sussex is setting up
3. Will gradually work towards reducing and subsequently eliminating the use of single-use plastics (e.g. using refillable containers for cleaning products, eliminating so-called disposable plastic cups and avoiding using laminating sheets for one-off occasions – reusable plastic sleeves can be used instead.)
4. Encourages the City Council staff to liaise with hirers of the facilities to ensure that hirers have considered reducing or eliminating their use of single-use plastics.

This Council recommends that the conditions of hire of the building should in the longer term be modified to include discouraging the use of single-use plastics wherever practically possible and encouraging the use of other alternatives that are compostable.

5. Promotes a deposit system to the District and County Councils and to our MP. Such a scheme has the potential to revolutionize our reliance on single-use plastics and keep litter off the streets. (Residents would be incentivised to return bottles to shops in order to get their deposit back).
6. Sets up a Task and Finish Group to look into the use of single-use plastics in the City Council’s work and the Council’s role as a promoter of best practise to the citizens of Chichester.

Councillor Sharp proposed the above Notice of Motion and was seconded by Councillor Plowman.

The Mayor explained that the Notice of Motion would be deferred to the three Standing Committees without further discussion.

NOTICE OF MOTION (2) FROM COUNICLLOR SHARP

The Mayor asked Councillor Sharp to introduce the Notice of Motion.

Full Council believes that:

1. All governments (national, regional and local) have a duty to limit the negative impacts of Climate Breakdown, and local governments that recognise this should not wait for their national governments to change their policies. It is important for the residents of Chichester and the UK that cities commit to carbon neutrality as quickly as possible;
2. Cities are uniquely placed to lead the world in reducing carbon emissions, as they are in many ways easier to decarbonise than rural areas – for example because of their capacity for local energy generation and public transport;
3. The consequences of global temperature rising above 1.5°C are so severe that preventing this from happening must be humanity's number one priority; and,
4. Bold climate action can deliver economic benefits in terms of new jobs, economic savings and market opportunities (as well as improved well-being for people worldwide).

Full Council calls on the Mayor to:

1. Declare a 'Climate Emergency';
2. Pledge to make the city of Chichester carbon neutral by 2030, taking into account both production and consumption emissions;
3. Call on Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make the 2030 target possible;
4. Work with other councils and governments (both within the UK and internationally) to determine and implement best practice methods to limit Global Warming to less than 1.5°C;
5. Continue to work with partners across the city and region to deliver this new goal through all relevant strategies and plans;
6. Set up a Task and Finish Group to look into the matter in greater detail. Consider whether it would be advisable to take into account climate change impacts, when debating planning applications, or taking part in consultations, commenting on reports, plans and reviews put to the Council.
7. Report to Full Council within six months with the actions the Mayor/Council will take to address this emergency.

Members are asked to refer to the Supporting Notes set out in Councillor Sharp's email to all Councillors dated 23 November 2018

Councillor Sharp proposed the above Notice of Motion and was seconded by Councillor Kilby.

The Mayor explained that the Notice of Motion would be deferred to the three Standing Committees without further discussion.

Councillor Sharp suggested that maybe consideration could be given to including 'Climate Change' in the Standing Committees Terms of Reference.

15. LOCAL BUILDINGS LIST

(Planning and Conservation Committee Minute 142 refers)

(Council Minute 68 refers)

To consider a letter of objection received from the Chairman of the Chichester Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CCAAC)

(attached)

Chairman to report

16. MINUTES OF SUB-COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS

(Copy previously circulated)

(i) Planning Delegation Sub-Committee

4 April 2019 (Lists 11, 12 and 13)

25 April 2019 (Lists 14, 15 and 16)

To set a date for the next meeting of the Sub-Committee

17. ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED ON AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

DATE OF NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY 26 JUNE 2019

To : Members of the Planning and Conservation Committee

Councillors: Bell, Bowden, Gaskin, Joy and Norrell

Ex Officio Members:

The Mayor (Councillor Plowman) and Deputy Mayor (Councillor J Hughes)

Chairman of Finance Committee

Chairman of Community Affairs Committee

Planning Adviser and Mayoral/Administrative Assistant

The filming, photographing and recording of City Council meetings is now permitted by those members of the press and public attending. This includes the use of mobile devices by those using social media. It

would be appreciated if anyone who wishes to do this could let the Chairman know before the meeting commences.

However, these provisions will not apply on occasions where the press and public are excluded from the meeting when confidential matters are discussed.

It is requested that discretion is exercised and nothing done to disrupt or distract the meeting in any way. The Chairman will reserve the right to request that filming/recording ceases if it is having a detrimental effect upon the meeting. If you do not wish to be filmed then please let the Chairman know so that alternative arrangements can be made.



CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

**ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE WORK OF
THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MARCH 2018-APRIL 2019
REPORT BY ANNA WHITTY, PLANNING ADVISER**

1. INTRODUCTION

This report covers the period 1 April 2018 – 31 March 2019 and reflects the work undertaken by the Planning Delegation Sub-Committee and the Planning and Conservation Committee.

2. PLANNING COMMITTEES

All planning applications within the parish are considered by the City Council, but there is insufficient resource to comment on every application. Applications which have the least potential for impact upon matters of public interest, or those which require specific arboricultural or legal expertise to assess, are therefore screened by the planning adviser upon receipt of the weekly list.

Applications with greater potential for impact on the public realm are taken to the Planning Delegation sub-committee with a recommendation from the planning adviser either not to object, or to object and on what basis.

Major applications are heard at Planning and Conservation Committee. This Committee also covers any policy issues or consultations from relevant bodies, enforcement and appeals.

Both the Planning and Conservation Committee and the Planning Delegation Sub-Committee were chaired by Cllr Jane Kilby and the vice-chair was Cllr Roger Keyworth.

3. PLANNING PERFORMANCE

The City Council was consulted on a total number of 528 applications in the past 12 months ie: 1 April 2018 - 31 March 2019. The total number of applications considered by committee and responded to by the City Council was 117.

An objection by Chichester City Council will normally result in the application having to be heard by Chichester District Council's Planning Committee (this is not necessarily the case with minor, domestic applications, or tree applications). The City Council therefore aims to provide clear and helpful responses where it is necessary to object to development; this includes clear planning reasons for the objection, detailing the harm to matters of public interest and, where possible, how the objection could be overcome (for example by removing illumination from advertisements). This approach gives the developer a means to amend their proposals and improve their proposed development, in order to overcome the objection and have their application dealt with through the delegated procedure of Chichester District Council.

4. CONCLUSION

Following the recommendations to the District and County Councils, the corresponding decisions have been monitored. Prior to determination, 12 applications were amended in accordance with City Council comments in order to make the development acceptable. Of those applications which have been decided to date, the average approval rate was 77%; this rises to 89% for those applications to which the City Council did not object and falls to 44% of those to which the City objected. 84% of decisions were made in accordance with the City Council's recommendation. It can be concluded that the City Council continues to positively influence development within the city.



CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

REPORT ON PLANNING COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

ANNA WHITTY, PLANNING ADVISER.

Introduction:

This report is to inform members of the options open to the City Council in dealing with planning application consultations at Committee.

Chichester City Council is consulted on all planning applications within the parish by the Local Planning Authority, Chichester District Council (CDC), and the County Planning Authority, West Sussex County Council (WSCC). The City Council is notified of CDC applications via the weekly list. CDC application consultations to the City Council typically number in excess of 600 per year. WSCC applications within the city are relatively few (less than 10 per year) and only relate to minerals, waste or County's own development (such as schools or fire stations), these are notified by email on an as and when basis.

Current procedure:

The weekly list of planning applications is sent to all Councillors each week. Any Councillor or Tree Warden may request that a particular application be heard at committee. Upon receipt of the weekly list, the Planning Advisor assesses the applications. As the City Council does not have the resource to comment on every application, the applications which have the least potential for impact upon matters of public interest and applications which require specific arboricultural or legal assessment, are screened by the planning adviser. Those screened out include applications relating to trees, minor householder applications, and legal determinations as to whether planning permission is required or whether a development is lawful. This part of current planning procedure is not proposed to change.

Currently, applications with potential to impact upon the public realm, such as most changes of use, advertisements not conforming to the design guidance, and new buildings, are taken to the Planning Delegation Sub-Committee held every 3 weeks during daytime hours. Each committee date is set at the previous committee to ensure sufficient Members can attend to make the committee quorate. This enables the City Council to meet the 21 day statutory deadline for planning consultations in most cases.

Major applications (proposing 10 or more dwellings) are heard at Planning and Conservation Committee. This Committee also covers any policy issues or consultations from relevant bodies, enforcement and appeals, and new street/house naming. This committee meets every 4 weeks on dates booked up to a year in advance.

Minor amendments to applications are responded to by the Planning Adviser, in consultation with the Chairman, or in accordance with the comments of the planning committee which considered the original application. This is not proposed to change.

The current procedure has worked well in the past and allows the City Council to respond quickly to planning consultations. However, if there is insufficient attendance by Members at a Planning Delegation Sub-Committee, the meeting would not be quorate, and decisions could not then be made.

Alternative procedure:

As an alternative, it is open to the City Council to forego the Planning Delegation Sub-Committee, and instead determine all the relevant applications at Planning and Conservation Committee.

Risk-Benefit analysis:

Historically, there have been a higher number of major applications averaging around 1 per month in 2016. In the last 2 years this has declined to around 1 every 2-3 months. There is therefore a reduced need for two separate committees and the spare capacity at Planning and Conservation Committee can be put to more efficient use, though this may occasionally result in a very full agenda and consequent long committee.

Having a single committee every 4 weeks, booked up to a year in advance, improves transparency for members of the public.

With a one-committee system, there would be an increased the risk that the statutory 21-day period for responding to planning consultations may be missed. However, normal timescales for determining planning applications is 8 weeks for minor applications and 12 weeks for majors, therefore a 4-weekly committee is unlikely to result in applications being determined before the City Council's comments can be taken into account. It would be possible to notify CDC in advance where responses would be delayed beyond the 21-day period to ensure the relevant planning officer is aware of our wish to comment before the application is determined.

The risks and benefits can be summarised as follows:

Benefits:

- Greater Efficiency for the City Council
- Greater Transparency for the public

- Reduced potential for meetings not being quorate

Risks:

- Increased potential for late responses [mitigation: unlikely to delay a decision]
- Increased length of Planning and Conservation Committees

Conclusion:

It would be reasonable, should Members so decide, to combine the current two planning committees into a single Planning and Conservation Committee meeting every 4 weeks. Members may wish to proceed on this basis for a trial period of a year, following which a report from the Planning Adviser can outline the results so that a permanent decision can be made.

Recommendation: That the Planning Delegation Sub-Committee be discontinued, and that the relevant planning applications be heard at Planning and Conservation Committee.



CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING ADVISER'S REPORTS FOR PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY 22 MAY 2019 AT 5.30PM

APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

List 17 (extract) – 24 April 2019

CC/19/01134/REM

Miller Homes Ltd

Land West Of Centurion Way And West Of Old Broyle Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 3PH

All outstanding Reserved Matters for the erection of 73 residential dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, informal open space and associated works on Phase 2, Parcel A, pursuant to permission 14/04301/OUT.

Site and Proposal

This is a reserved matters application for part of the West of Chichester (White House Farm) Strategic Housing Site which has outline planning permission for a total of up to 750 dwellings over the whole site. This application deals with land parcel "A" in the north eastern area of the site, and proposes 73 dwellings.

Main Considerations

The West of Chichester site is strategic development land (SDL) site allocated for development providing a total of 1600 houses on the site, 1,200 of which should be provided within the plan period, i.e. by 2029. Outline planning permission, with all matters except access reserved, was granted under reference 14/04301/OUT for 750 dwellings with a local centre, school, open space and associated development.

The access has been approved through the outline planning application and is not a matter which can be reconsidered as part of this application. The reserved matters for consideration as part of this application are: Landscaping, Layout, Scale, and Appearance. The reserved matters application for 73 dwellings accords with the approved outline permission masterplan, being an area of low-medium density 2-storey housing.

The site forms a natural parcel of land within the wider site, surrounded on all sides by existing vegetation, to be retained and incorporated into the layout and landscaping of the development. Front gardens are minimal in size and will be turfed; tall planting is unlikely to be suitable due to lack of space and the need for highway visibility.

The proposed layout accords with the outline planning permission granted under reference 14/04301/OUT and the plans approved under the reserved matters application for the spine road under reference 18/01587/REM. The vehicular access to the site is from the south, as previously approved. There is a footway linking to the wider site to the north and north-east of the site. There is a missed opportunity to provide a pedestrian/cycle link directly to the east of the site to the SANG car park.

The parking is laid out such that a significant number of dwellings must double park, or triple park in their garage and/or on their drive to achieve the required parking. This is considered unsuitable provision, likely to harm amenity and potentially highway safety due to the frequency and proximity of neighbours manoeuvring their vehicles on and off the road when parking, and by encouraging parking outside of allocated bays.

The dwellings proposed are varied in style with a palette of materials to provide visual interest. This includes both red and orange multi-tonal facing bricks with some use of painted brick and flint for variety to some of the frontages. It would be possible to improve the quality of the buildings' appearance by using the accent material on the side and rear elevations as well as the front, especially with regard to flint, as it would then be perceived as a building material rather than just a facing material. There is a single door and window design for the whole site, the door is black GRP with a small rectangular glazed feature, it is of poor aesthetic quality. Similarly, the windows are white upvc with a heavy outer frame and a thin internal glazing bar; the appearance is of low quality aesthetically and does not reflect the surrounding character. Better quality windows and doors would be required for the development to be acceptable and to meet the requirements of Policy 33 of the Local Plan.

There are approximately 26% 2-bed dwellings, 44% 3-bed dwellings and 30% 4+ bedroomed dwellings. No 1-bed properties are proposed on this part of the site. Whilst this does not strictly meet the recommended SHMA figures (Market housing 35% 1-2 bed, 50% 3 bed and 15% 4+ bed), it is noted that the housing mix will be required to vary across the site, particularly as there are local centres where it will be necessary to have higher density land use, with a predominance of 1-2 bed properties and fewer opportunities to provide larger 3-4 bed properties. Given this wider context, the housing mix is considered acceptable. 30% of properties proposed are affordable housing in an appropriate mix of sizes, in accordance with Policy 34 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

The proposal requires changes to the layout and appearance in order to constitute acceptable development.

Recommendation: Objection in relation to the layout and appearance:

Layout

The provision of parking which necessitates double and triple parking is not considered adequate. There is a missed opportunity to provide a pedestrian/cycle link directly to the east of the site to the SANG car park.

Appearance

The design of the proposed windows with thick white UPVC frame and thin internal glazing bars is unacceptable, as is the proposed design for the doors. The proposed windows and doors do not reflect the surrounding character and would harm visual amenity.

Where there is flint frontage to a building, all elevations should be flint faced. Consideration should be given to similar treatment of the side elevations where other accents are proposed only to front elevations.

CC/19/00621/FUL and

CC/19/00622/LBC

Mistral 15 South Street Chichester PO19 1EJ

Change of colour to the shop front.

Site and proposal

The site is a grade II listed building within the city centre conservation area. The proposal is to re-paint the shopfront.

Main Considerations

The site is prominently located close to the cross at the city centre, within the conservation area and the building itself is grade II listed. The existing shop front was a grey/blue colour and it is proposed to re-paint the shop front in Dulux Minted Glory, a light mint green which would be a relatively subtle colour change.

Conclusion

The colour change would not have any undue impact upon the listed building or conservation area.

Recommendation: No objection

CC/19/00883/FUL and
CC/19/00884/ADV
62-64 East Street Chichester PO19 1HL
Replacement shopfront.

Site and proposal

The site is the former Poundland, a large shop within the city centre. The site is not listed but there are listed buildings either side and opposite the building and it is within the conservation area. The proposal is to replace the shopfront and signage.

Main Considerations

The former Poundland store is one of the larger units within the city centre. The existing shopfront is modern and the building is not listed. The proposed new shopfront would improve accessibility with double doors.

The signage would feature acrylic lettering and an image of a clown-type toy. This does not accord with the Chichester shop front design guidance. This is likely to have some impact upon the conservation area. The hanging sign would replace an existing one, albeit slightly larger in size.

Conclusion

The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon visual amenity and the character of the conservation area. This could be remedied with alteration to the design and materials, specifically by omitting the image on the fascia and by using painted lettering and a painted background on the fascia and hanging sign.

Recommendation: Objection to the proposed design and materials on the signage which do not accord with the relevant guidance. No objection should the proposal be painted lettering on a painted background and the image removed from the fascia.

No objection to the changes to the shopfront itself.

CC/19/00957/DOM

Oakfield Church Road Chichester West Sussex

Demolition of front porch and erection of single storey front extension. Alterations and additions to fenestration.

Site and proposal

The site is a detached chalet bungalow located in Church Road, towards the eastern boundary of the city behind the large Homesense unit. The proposal is for a small single storey extension to the front of the property.

Main Considerations

The site is an existing chalet bungalow within an area of mixed housing character with no fixed building line, it is not within a conservation area. The proposal is a modest single storey front extension. In this context, it would have little visual impact and no impact upon the character of the area.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable, particularly given the context in which it would be sited.

Recommendation: No objection

CC/19/00990/FUL and

CC/19/00991/LBC

Parkers of Chichester

29-30 North Street Chichester West Sussex PO19 1LX

Internal alterations to sub-divide existing shop and provide 1 no. 4 bed flat at first and second floor including the addition of 7 no. rooflights at rear.

Site and proposal

The site is a grade II listed building within the city centre conservation area. The proposal is to divide the retail unit into 2 and to use the two floors above as a 4-bed flat.

Main Considerations

The proposal would retain A1 use at ground floor level, and would provide a residential use at first and second floor level in the form of a 4-bedroomed flat. This would accord with local and national planning policies. There would be little external change. The second doorway in the frontage would be brought back into use to form the entrance to the second retail unit. To the rear, four rooflights would be visible on the rear of the building, with three on a roofslope which is not visible from the ground.

The proposed works would bring the upper floors back into use and offer two smaller A1 retail units. There would be no harm to amenity.

Conclusion

The proposal accords with policy and would not harm the character or appearance of the listed building or conservation area.

Recommendation: No objection

CC/19/01038/FUL and

CC/19/01039/LBC

Hollybrook House 4 East Pallant Chichester PO19 1TR

Change of use from business to single residential dwelling and replacement extension with garden area.

Site and Proposal

The site is a grade II listed building within the city centre conservation area, in the predominantly residential area of West Pallant. The application is to return the grade II listed building to residential use.

Main considerations

The building is grade II listed. It would have been a residential building originally and the proposal is to return it to residential use from commercial use. Policy 26 of the Local Plan aims to protect against the loss of buildings in commercial or office use, however the emerging Local Plan review lends some flexibility to this policy and it is not considered that the strictest interpretation of the policy would be appropriate given that this was originally designed as a residential dwelling.

Conclusion

The proposal to return the grade II listed building to its original use as a residential dwelling is considered appropriate.

Recommendation: No objection.

List 18 (extracts) – 1 May 2019

CC/19/00862/LBC

9 St Pancras Chichester West Sussex

Proposed change of use from Takeaway A5 to Cafe A3.

Site and Proposal

This application is for the change of use of an existing takeaway (A5 use) to a café (A3 use). The site is in St Pancras, just outside of the secondary shopping frontage area.

Main Considerations

The site is just outside of the secondary shopping frontage area and the policy threshold of non-A1 uses would not apply; in any case non-A1 use is currently only 53%, well below the 75%, and the unit is already within non-retail use. There would therefore be no policy objection to the change from A5 (takeaway) to A3 (café) use and the proposed change would not have any impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre.

There would be little impact upon amenity due to the similar nature of the uses.

Conclusion

The development would be acceptable in terms of policy, amenity and impact on the city centre.

Recommendation: No objection.

List 19 (extracts) – 8 May 2019

CC/19/00919/FUL

Feather And Black 26 Terminus Road Chichester West Sussex

Change of use to venue for live shows and music covering all aspects of performance and celebrity acts, with dinner served to accompany the shows and a late night music venue.

Site and Proposal

The site is a commercial unit within the industrial estate of Terminus Road. The proposal is for an entertainment venue.

Main Considerations

Policy 26 of the Local Plan aims to protect B2/B8 employment uses. It requires that extensive marketing is completed to show that there is no reasonable possibility that the building could be used for such employment uses before a change of use is allowed. The developer has not submitted any evidence of such marketing and the development would therefore be contrary to policy in allowing the loss of a building in employment use. The applicant submits that they would employ significant numbers of staff, however, should a change of use be granted, staffing numbers could not be enforced, and could change with any subsequent owner. The result in the long term would be a loss of employment space.

There is an established commercial and industrial character in this area, which the change of use would significantly impact being an entertainment use more suited to either the city centre or a unit within the Chichester Gate development.

Conclusion

The development would result in the loss of an employment unit and no evidence has been submitted to justify this, contrary to Policy 26 of the Local Plan. The proposal is out of character with surrounding uses.

Recommendation: Objection. The development is contrary to Policy 26 of the Local Plan and would detrimentally affect the character of the area.

CC/19/01163/FUL and CC/19/01164/LBC

6A Northgate Chichester PO19 1BA

Change of use of existing retail floorspace (Use Class A1) to form a single residential dwelling (use Class C3).

Site and Proposal

The site is grade II listed former shop building within the city centre conservation area in Northgate. The proposal is for a change of use to residential.

Main Considerations

The proposal is to change the use of this former shop into a residential dwelling. The shop frontage would remain but would not be used for access. Short railings would be used to secure the unused entrance. The proposal would harm the character, appearance and legibility of the building, to the detriment of the conservation area.

Conclusion

The development would be unacceptable in terms of its impact on the grade II listed building.

Recommendation: Objection. The proposal would harm the character, appearance and legibility of the building and would detrimentally impact the conservation area.

The Town Clerk
Chichester City Council
The Council House
North Street
CHICHESTER
Sussex
PO19 1LQ

RECEIVED
12 APR 2019
Agenda Item 12

11 April 2019

Dear Rodney

Local Buildings List

At the CCAAC meeting of 9 April the report in the April issue of *Chichester Local* of the City Council Planning and Conservation Committee meeting of 6 March, was discussed. There was much disquiet in learning from that report that removal from the Local List of certain buildings in the Southern Gateway area was being advocated, a fact which was borne out by examination of the City Council minutes on the website.

The local list was, as I am sure you are aware, a community exercise, and one in which CCAAC were heavily involved with the processing and scoring of the buildings put forward (using the Norwich system) and carrying out the necessary background research. The information was passed to the CDC Conservation Team who then carried out an independent scoring exercise and those buildings whose scorings matched were put on the list. Since then other entries have been made from time to time, all to provide an important measure of protection to those buildings which, although not statutorily listed, were none-the-less of great local significance.

At the said meeting of 6 March, as recorded under Item 128, the City Planning and Conservation Committee - "...proposed to request that the following be removed from the Local List" :

- "Chichester Bus Garage
- The former Chichester High School for Girls
- Chichester Magistrates Court
- The Railway Station (excluding the signal box)"

These are all important 20C buildings, and the bus garage particularly so, so CCAAC are very concerned that this measure of protection is being proposed for removal. In the light of this I was mandated to write to you to register our protest and seek answers to the following:

- 1) Why is the City Council, who as the parish council is neither the Local Planning Authority nor the keeper of the Local List, advocating de-listings? The system set up in 2006 was that anyone could put forward a proposal for entry on the list, but a request for a de-listing is unprecedented. Whilst, perhaps, it would not be surprising to learn that Chichester District Council wanted to de-list buildings that were in the way of its Southern Gateway Development aspirations – especially ones they own - it is difficult to understand the City Council's desire in this connection.
- 2) What is the City Council's justification for de-listing these particular buildings? The former Girls' High School façade was saved by virtue of its being on the list, otherwise the developer would have demolished it. The other buildings though have not undergone any physical change since being placed on the list so there has been no diminution of their architectural/townscape values nor any devaluation of their historic significance. As such their 'Norwich' scores are unchanged.

Examination of earlier City Planning and Conservation Committee minutes reveals that they began a review of the Local List back in October 2018, and as a result several buildings were proposed to be added, which is right and proper and in the spirit of the Local Listing exercise. However removal is not in that spirit, and it is indeed ironic that in this year of celebration of fifty years of conservation in Chichester, removal of protection is being advocated.

Such is the strength of feeling on this matter I request to attend the next Full Council meeting - which I believe is scheduled for 24 April - and ask the above questions.

In closing I refer to another part of the minute under Item 128 where it is stated that the next meeting would discuss further buildings, namely:

- The Planetarium
- The Richmond Arms
- The new canal building
- The railway station signal box

It is not clear in what context they are to be discussed, but I would point out that both the Richmond Arms and the signal box are, in fact, Grade II listed and thus do not feature on the Local List.

Yours Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A H J Green', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

A H J Green
Chairman, CCAAC



PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

To consider, make recommendations and decisions as authorised on the following :

- All planning applications referred to the City Council.
- All other planning matters concerning the City, including liaison with potential developers or any agencies proposing change in the built environment.
- All matters concerning highways and other means of access in adjacent to the City, or likely to have any impact upon the City.
- Street naming and signing.
- All matters concerning the environment in the City and adjacent to it, or likely to have an impact upon the City.
- Operation of City Environmental matters within an agreed budget.

To appoint such Sub-Committees and Working Groups as may be necessary to fulfil the above requirements. The following Sub-Committee reports to this Committee :

- Planning Delegation Sub-Committee

The Town Clerk shall be authorised to take the necessary action to implement approved decisions of the Committee.