

**MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL MEETING OF
THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 7 JANUARY 2021 AT 5.00PM**

- PRESENT:** Councillors Joy (Chairman) Bell, Bowden and Gaskin
- EX OFFICIO:** The Mayor (Councillor Plowman) Deputy Mayor (Councillor J Hughes)
Councillors Apel and Scicluna
- ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Planning Adviser, Property Manager and Mayoral/Administrative
Assistant, Councillors Gershater and Sharp
West Sussex County Councillor Simon Oakley
Isobel Ballsdon, MPC Agency (for CC/19/03191/REM)
Craig Burden, Redrow Housing (for CC/19/03191/REM)
- APOLOGIES:** Councillor Turbfield

**93 MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE HELD ON 10 DECEMBER 2020
AND THE SPECIAL MEETING OF COMMITTEE HELD ON 17 DECEMBER 2020**

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meetings held on 10 December 2020 and the Special Meeting of Committee held on 17 December 2020 having been printed and circulated be approved and be signed by the Chairman as a correct record at a later date.

94 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

As recorded above and accepted by the Committee.

**95 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE IN MATTERS ON
THE AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING**

The Mayor and Councillor Scicluna, as a member of Chichester District Council and as a member of the CCAAC declared a Personal Interest. Councillors Apel and Bowden, as members of Chichester District Council, West Ward, declared a Personal Interest. The Mayor, as an allotment holder declared a Personal Interest in application CC/20/03167/REM. Councillor Apel, as an allotment holder's spouse, declared a Personal Interest in application CC/20/03167/REM.

**96 STREET NAMING AND NUMBERING
PHASE 3C WHITEHOUSE FARM (VISTRY LINDEN HOMES) PLOT TO POSTAL**

The Property Manager, with the aid of a visual plan, showed members the site for consideration and explained the rationale behind the names suggested.

Councillor Bowden expressed his displeasure at the use of "Mead" and "Way" etc in the naming process and thought that "Street" or "Road" was more much appropriate.

Councillor Scicluna further explained the background behind the suggested names saying that all but one of whom were local artists. Councillor Scicluna added that it would be useful if a brief explanation of the reason for the name could be displayed on the street nameplate. She added that she had obtained permission from the relatives for the names to be used.

Opinion was divided about the use of "Mead" or "Way" etc. instead of "Street" or "Road". Councilor Apel suggested that Schirmer Way and Harris Way could be Road. This was supported by the Committee.

It was therefore put to the vote and RESOLVED that Schirmer Way be Schirmer Road and Harris Way be Harris Road and that all other suggested names remain unchanged. The Property Manager would advise Royal Mail accordingly.

Councillors Gaskin and Scicluna abstained from the voting.

97 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

- (i) CC/19/03191/REM
Land North East of Graylingwell Park
Amended plans

Craige Burden, of Redrow Housing, was present for this item and, with the aid of a visual presentation outlined the issues on site, explained the direction amended plans were likely to take and invited questions from members.

The Planning Adviser said that this application had been before the Committee previously at which an objection was raised. The City Council was then requested by the applicant's agent to review the application in light of amended plans; unfortunately, shortly before the Committee it became apparent that further amended plans were yet to be submitted, and as such any discussion of the proposals was premature. However, with such short notice, the decision was taken to keep the item on the agenda and members were advised not to form an opinion on the proposal based on the current plans, but to familiarise themselves with the site and the relevant issues, and ask any pertinent questions, in order to prepare for a future discussion on the full amended proposals in due course.

The Planning Adviser, with the aid of a visual presentation, explained the previous proposals and some amendments to these. She reminded the Committee of the previous objection to the proposal and the issues raised previously and still outstanding at this stage, subject to possible further amendments, namely:

- A significantly detrimental lack of outdoor amenity space had been proposed for residents of the block of flats (forming part of the affordable housing provision) and a similar lack existed for a nearby terrace.
- Landscaping was lacking. The masterplan showed tree lined streets which were almost universally omitted in detailed plans so far.
- Cycle and footpaths: Provision of a public path, required along the linear park, was proposed to be in the form of permission for the public to use the shared surface of a private road. A public path should be easily identifiable as such through its physical appearance and design, in order to encourage public use of it. A public path which people cannot recognise as such, because it is not clear from its appearance that public access is allowed, is not fit for purpose. A shared surface along a private road, presumably with "private road" signs, would not appear as a publicly accessible footpath, or encourage public use of it. A purpose-built physical path, clearly provided for the purpose of providing public access along the linear path, should be provided.
- Requirement of pavements on both sides of the road.

- Shared surface issues. Only those roads in the crescent, specifically presented as shared surface, would be suitable as such. Other roads should not be presented as shared surface as a way to avoid the necessary provision of pavements on both sides.

The Planning Adviser said that no decision would be taken at this Committee and it was hoped that the City Council's previously expressed concerns would be further addressed when the application came back to the Committee for consideration.

The Chairman thanked Craige Burden for attending the meeting and giving his presentation.

Week 49 – 2 December 2020

CC/20/02643/FUL - Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson
115 Cedar Drive Chichester PO19 3EL
Demolition of existing bungalow and garage. Replacement chalet bungalow with integral garage. Associated external works.

Councillor Apel left the meeting

Recommendation: No objection

CC/20/02990/FUL and CC/20/02996/ADV - Case Officer: William Price
31-33 South Street Chichester PO19 1EL
FUL: Introduction of cafe windows to shopfront.
ADV: Installation of 3 no. externally illuminated fascia signs, 1 no. internally illuminated projecting sign, 1 no. internally illuminated menu box and decals to glazing.

Councillor Scicluna left the meeting.

Recommendation: No objection in principle, but: Objection in respect of the signage materials, which include acrylic lettering, and internal illumination, contrary to the Chichester Advertisement Design Guidance, which would detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the conservation area. No objection should the application be amended to replace this with appropriate hand painted timber signage and external illumination only for both the fascia and the projecting sign. No objection to the internally illuminated menu box subject to suitably low lux levels. It is requested that the building number be included on the fascia, and that details of the proposed awning and the proposed colour of the first floor brickwork paint be submitted for approval.

Week 50 – 9 December 2020

CC/20/03048/FUL - Case Officer: Vicki Baker
2-8 The Broadway, 1-21 Mytchett House, 1-3 Cossells Road And 1-6 Dempsey Road
Chichester West Sussex PO19 6BJ
Application of insulated render system and flat to pitch roof conversion to service family accommodation to include new gutters and down pipes.

Recommendation: No objection

CC/20/03108/REM - Case Officer: Steve Harris

Miller Homes Ltd

Land On The West Side Of Broyle Road Chichester West Sussex

All outstanding Reserved Matters for the erection of 65 residential dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, informal open space and associated works on Phase 6.H, pursuant to permission 14/04301/OUT.

Recommendation: No objection. The City Council is pleased to note that our previous comments in respect of surrounding land parcels appear to have been heeded in respect of this application, particularly in respect of provision of cycle and footpaths around the site and a significant improvement on solar panel provision created by an increase in southern facing properties. We look forward to further improvement on future land parcels.

Councillor Bowden abstained from the voting on this application. Councillor Gaskin voted against the recommendation.

Week 51 – 16 December 2020

CC/20/02905/REM - Case Officer: Jeremy Bushell

Graylingwell Hospital College Lane Chichester West Sussex

Application for approval of updated Reserved Matters in respect of 117 new dwellings on land at Phase 9a, Graylingwell Park, pursuant to Outline Planning Permission

CC/14/01018/OUT.

Key issues:

Councillor Gershater left the meeting.

Recommendation: Objection on the basis that insufficient parking is proposed, the layout is sub-optimal in terms of connectivity and permeability and the already limited outdoor amenity space for the apartment residents has been further reduced, so as to constitute unacceptable living standards. Should the developer identify a need to provide more units or higher density development on the site, the opportunity should be taken to provide this in connection with improvements to the design and layout of the proposal. Specifically, the footprint of the apartment buildings should be reduced, in order to provide adequate outdoor amenity space for residents. Smaller apartment units could be provided (one bedroom rather than two), accommodation could be provided within the roof space, or, with a suitably high quality of architectural design, an additional storey could be added to the apartment buildings, as flat roofed buildings, if this could be achieved without exceeding the ridge height of the previously approved apartment buildings.

Councillor Bowden voted against the recommendation.

CC/20/03166/REM - Case Officer: Steve Harris

Vistry Southern

Land On The West Side Of Broyle Road Chichester West Sussex

All outstanding Reserved Matters for the erection of 86 dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, informal open space and associated work on Phase 6I, pursuant to permission 14/04301/OUT.

Recommendation: No objection. The City Council is pleased to note that our previous comments in respect of surrounding land parcels appear to have been heeded in respect of this application, particularly in respect of provision of footpaths and solar panel provision. We look forward to further improvement on future land parcels.

Councillor Bowden abstained for voting on this application.

CC/20/03167/REM - Case Officer: Steve Harris
Miller Homes Ltd And Vistry Group Ltd
Land On The West Side Of Broyle Road Chichester West Sussex
All outstanding Reserved Matters for creation of allotment gardens with associated parking, landscaping, informal open space and works pursuant to permission 14/04301/OUT.

Recommendation: No objection. It is noted that there is a square area of about 400sqm within the centre of the site for which there are no details; the area has been left blank on the plans. A small number of car and cycle parking spaces could be provided here which would serve not only the allotment users, but residents crossing the site here to the south to visit the country park.

98 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – AN UPDATE ON PROGRESS

The Mayor updated members and said that a meeting had been arranged with Richard Eastham of FERIA Urbanism on 8 January 2021. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the roles and responsibilities and a forward plan. The previous work of the Planning Adviser had been acknowledged and appreciated. The new format of the Steering Committee would be forthcoming.

99 UPDATE ON LOCAL PLAN HOUSING TARGET FIGURES

The Planning Adviser said that the Government's proposed changes to the formula for calculating housing target figures had now been withdrawn. As Chichester District Council had recently issued their housing target figures (634pa districtwide), broken down into Parish requirements, just before the government's announcement, it was anticipated that CDC would clarify the position on these figures shortly in light of the government's change in stance.

Councillor Bowden questioned the accuracy of this and Councillor Oakley clarified that, anticipating that such a government decision may occur, CDC had in fact based their recently published 634 house per annum (District wide) target, and therefore its associated parish targets ("the distribution") on the previous or original housing target calculation method. This meant that the recent figures published by CDC just before the government's announcement were not affected by it and remain correct.

100 WHITEHOUSE FARM – FEEDBACK

The Planning Adviser said that regarding Phase 2 of the Whitehouse Farm development, the developers needed some of the school's land in order to build an access road to link the phase 2 development to the local road network in Chichester; the school was therefore in a strong negotiating position in terms of what they could ask for in return. They required some land on the Whitehouse Farm site to build a school building and this ideally needed to be as close as possible to the sports pitches which the school and the community would both use as a shared facility. Negotiation with the developer was ongoing.

Councillor Bowden sought the advice of Councillor Oakley regarding West Sussex County Council's Education Department and the use of the playing fields. The Planning Adviser said that it was hoped that the pitches would be shared use facilities, with the school and the community. Councillor Oakley advised that WSCC were wary of shared use sports pitches as there could be challenges with regards to this.

The Chairman updated members on the school land swap idea and said that there were many issues and possibilities being investigated. As it stands, a primary school would be set up in Whitehouse Farm Phase 1; this could go ahead as planned and Bishop Luffa be replaced by a new building on Whitehouse Farm with the same pupil capacity and intake, or a primary school could be incorporated into an integrated all-through school replacing Bishop Luffa on the Whitehouse Farm site, in which case the primary school site could be used to provide additional open space, sports provision, housing or commercial development.

The Planning Adviser said that the developers were currently intending to build the shell of the primary school and would need to submit a planning application shortly, in accordance with agreed timescales, showing the details of the primary school proposal. However, the seeking or granting of planning permission for a primary school did not necessarily mean that it must be built, only that it could, or may be built. Once granted permission, it would still be open to the developer at that point to propose something else for that primary school site (subject to a new planning application), if they could show that the primary school would be provided elsewhere.

Should it be possible to acquire a piece of land on Whitehouse Farm for a new secondary or all-through school, the construction of the new school would have to be financed somehow. A meeting with interested parties and other work had taken place to address the issue of how the construction of a new school building could be paid for, without cost to WSCC.

Costings for a new all-through or secondary school with sixth form would be likely to be in the region of £25-30m. The majority of these funds could be provided through development of the existing school site predominantly as a CARE village site, with 60-90 higher dependency care home beds for those with more intense care needs, 24/7 services, and 125-175 low dependency units, in the form of studios or 1-bed apartments for those who themselves needed some support to live independently, or who live with a spouse who does. A flexible arrangement across the site could facilitate the move of residents from lower-dependency to higher dependency units or care levels when this became necessary through ageing or other deterioration in their ability to live independently. This would mean those elderly residents or dementia sufferers would not have the unnecessary added stress of moving to an unknown new residential care home when their levels of need change, and allowed for the lower level care-dependent spouse of a higher level care-dependent resident to remain living with them, preserving dignity and happiness in old age and infirmity.

Some of the site may also remain available for traditional residential housing development. Councillors Gaskin and Bowden were keen to see a zero-carbon building on this site.

The Chairman said that progress was being made but there still a long way to go and he was keen to discuss this proposal with WSCC as owners of part of the field. WSCC, the Church of England and any other land owners, would all need to show their willingness to effectively give up their land ownership of the school site in order to make the scheme work. In return, a high quality, low carbon new school could be achieved, effectively for free, paid for by the development of excellent new elder care facilities, itself another significant benefit to the community. It is hoped that, because of the nature of the landowners as public bodies with an interest in community and social provision, such an agreement may be achievable.

The Chairman re-iterated that discussions were on-going to try to find a way of clarifying land ownership. Councillor Oakley advised that an approach could be made to the appropriate WSCC cabinet member.

101 ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED ON AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

- Neighbourhood Plan – update
- White House Farm

102 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 4 February 2021

The meeting closed at 7.20pm.