

**NOTES OF THE VIRTUAL MEETING OF
THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION WORKING GROUP MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 19 AUGUST 2021 AT 2.00PM**

PRESENT: Councillors Gaskin, Plowman (Chairman) and Quail

EX OFFICIO: The Mayor (Councillor J Hughes) and Councillors Apel and Scicluna

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Planning Adviser, Property Manager and Mayoral/Administrative Assistant, Councillor Sharp, Keith Bartlett (local resident for CC/21/02110/FUL)

APOLOGIES: The Deputy Mayor (Councillor Joy) and Councillor Gershater

ABSENT: Councillor Turbefeild

30 MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE HELD ON 22 JULY 2021

AGREED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021 having been printed and circulated be approved and be signed by the Chairman as a correct record at a later date.

31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

As recorded above.

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

The following Personal Interests were declared:

Councillor Plowman and Councillor Apel as members of Chichester District Council.
Councillors Plowman and Scicluna as a member of the CCAAC.
Councillor Quail as a member of the Westgate Residents Association.

33 STREET NAMING AND NUMBERING -THE SPIRES (REDROW HOMES)

The Property Manager with the aid of a visual layout plan explained to members the reasons behind the proposals. He invited Councillor Scicluna to give the historical background. Councillor Scicluna explained that James Kenny of Chichester District Council had researched the names and had suggested names from the Tithe Award for the Sub-Deanery, as advised. Members were then asked to consider the following street name proposals:

- Grayling House (Flats)
- Well House (Flats)
- Hacketts Way
- Adames Field
- Benness Drive
- Great Stable Road
- Lavant View

The Chairman said that it was important that the signage was explanatory to avoid any confusion. Councillor Quail enquired of an apostrophe for "Hacketts" Way. The Property Manager clarified that Royal Mail would not normally use an apostrophe. However, it was felt to be more appropriate to leave the apostrophe out and use "Hackett" Way instead.

It was AGREED that the names, as proposed be used with the addition of "Stable Crescent" off Great Stable Road, and that "Hacketts Way" become "Hackett Way".

The Property Manager would advise Royal Mail accordingly.

34 APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

The Planning Adviser, with the aid of a visual presentation explained the background of the following applications:

Week 28 – 14 July 2021

CC/21/02028/ADV and CC/21/02036/LBC - Case Officer: Alicia Snook

75 North Street Chichester PO19 1LQ

ADV: 1 no. non-illuminated lettering applied to shop fascia and 1 no. non-illuminated white vinyl lettering, fitted to inside of entrance door.

LBC: White powder-coated aluminium stud lettering applied to shop fascia and white vinyl lettering, fitted to inside of entrance door.

Objection. The materials proposed do not comply with the advertisement design guidance and would harm the character and appearance of the listed building and conservation area. No objection should the application be amended to painted lettering on the fascia. Please also include the building number.

CC/21/02085/ADV - Case Officer: Alicia Snook

Portfield Peugeot Garage Quarry Lane Chichester PO19 8NX

4no. internally illuminated fascia signs and 1no. internally illuminated double sided pylon sign.

No objection, however this is an important entrance into the city; lux levels should be reduced to a minimum and controlled by condition.

Week 29 - 21 July 2021 - **No Committee items**

Week 30 – 28 July 2021

CC/21/01786/FUL - Case Officer: William Price

Land At Royal Close Chichester West Sussex

Erection of 1 no. 2 storey dwelling, attached to existing flats 30-37 Royal Close.

No objection

CC/21/01966/ADV - Case Officer: Maria Tomlinson

Buffer Bear Nursery Spitalfield Lane Chichester PO19 6SE

Erection of 1 no. int-illum main fascia sign, 1 no. int-illum secondary fascia sign, 1no. int-illum double sided illuminated mini totem, 1 no. non-illum gate Sign, 2 no. non-illum car park post signs, 1 no. non-illum buggy park sign and 1 no. non-illum CCTV Sign.

Objection to the illumination of the totem sign, and to the internal illumination of the two signs on the building, due to the impact on the character of the area. No objection should the application be amended to a non-illuminated totem and externally illuminated signage on the building.

Week 31 – 4 August 2021

CC/21/02110/FUL - Case Officer: Martin Mew
23 Lavant Road Chichester PO19 5RA

Redevelopment of the site with creation of 5 no. flats and parking, landscaping and associated works. (Variation of condition 2 for permission CC/20/03226/FUL - amendments to rear roof slope to create a concealed roof terrace).

Mr Keith Bartlett a neighbour was in attendance for this item and addressed the meeting expressing his concerns and gave his representations to members.

Strong objection. The proposed roof terrace alterations would create an unattractive and incongruous roof form and would result in an increased sense of overbearing, overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity to neighbouring residents.

35 SIGNALISED CROSSING ON BOGNOR ROAD

Councillor Sharp addressed the meeting and explained the history which went back some way. The road was used by many elderly and vulnerable people and it was considered that a signalised crossing was an essential requirement. In 2017 enquiries had been made of West Sussex County Council about such a crossing but it had been advised that the pavement was too narrow. Local businesses had then started a petition which had been submitted to the Chichester South Local Committee just prior to the first lockdown.

Councillor Sharp had met with the WSCC highways engineer who had not ruled out a crossing but was unsure of what type. Councillor Sharp had pursued this via the scoring system ie: employment, air quality, sustainable travel etc. and had also written a brief. She had also carried out door-to-door research, encouraging people to lodge their reasons for installing a signalised crossing. Letters of support from Royal Close had also been sent.

Councillor Sharp was seeking the support of members to ask WSCC Highways to look into a community highways scheme where 40-50 from 120 scoring needed to be met. This could then be progressed via a camera counting the number of people who crossed at this point.

The Chairman invited members comments. Members were fully supportive. It was therefore AGREED that the Planning Adviser, in liaison with Councillor Sharp, would prepare a response and further AGREED that the Mayor would write a letter in support of this.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Sharp for her work in connection with this.

36 WHITE HOUSE FARM – FEEDBACK

The Chairman invited Councillor Apel to address the meeting. Councillor Apel said that the provision of a Medical Centre was unlikely to happen and that the NHS Care Commissioning Group (CCG) and GP's were attending the next Overview and Scrutiny meeting at Chichester District Council to discuss the situation. The CCG felt that the numbers were too low to justify a Medical facility. This was felt to be unacceptable in view of the number of houses being built and there would need to be further discussions.

Councillor Apel mentioned the diversion of the chalk stream and the recent heavy rain which had caused a trench down the side of the bank which led into a drain going into Newlands Lane. The impact of the water was reducing the width of the road causing instability of the road surface. There was a meeting with the Environmental Officer about this but responsibility for the land was in question.

Councillor Apel said that the YMCA had advised they would be happy to take over the medical centre and turn it into an all-purpose Centre, perhaps adding a room as a consulting

room for GP's. The developers were keen on this idea. The Chairman said that YMCA had changed their remit and were now doing nursery care and community links and this was a good community facility, run by themselves. The general feeling was that this would be an excellent facility for the community at White House Farm.

Significant concern remained about the non-provision of a medical centre at White House Farm. The Planning Adviser said that following last committee, members' concerns about both the possible lack of a medical centre (given that the alternative local GP practices were already oversubscribed and lacked sufficient parking for existing patients), and about the southern access route to phase two of the development, had been put to the developer's planning agent, Nick Billington, and to the CDC planning officer, Jo Bell. The developer advised that the concerns were noted and solutions were being investigated. The developer would advise Chichester City Council in due course about the proposed solutions, this is likely to be in September/October.

Councillor Quail, referring to the southern access road, had said a meeting had taken place recently with the Chairmen of a number of local Residents Associations and local Councillors. The developers' recent consultation had now closed and they would be addressing the issues raised. WSCC had asked the developers to look at the issue of safety and to bring forward a safety audit. Councillor Quail was pleased to note that some of the reservations were being taken seriously and had proposed to bring this forward to the next meeting of the West of Chichester Group.

The Chairman said that this was a very difficult issue and needed to be right at the start for this to be a satisfactory result. Councillor Apel said that should members have any questions on medical matters and GP provision, she would be happy to put these forward to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Sharp raised the issue of the east of the city with large numbers of people joining and that there needed to be a better balance. Liaison with developers was crucial. She said that this issue did not only apply to White House Farm and that other areas were also lacking medical facilities.

The Chairman re-iterated the lack of medical facilities overall.

The Chairman took the next two items together, not in order on the agenda.

37 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – AN UPDATE ON PROGRESS
LOCAL PLAN – UPDATE FROM MEETING ON 29 JULY 2021

The Chairman commented on the Members Briefing meeting held on 29 July re: Stockbridge relief road and A27 congestion and transport issues, together with wastewater issues. It was clear that in order to serve both existing residents and the number of new residents occupying the houses CDC is required (by central government targets) to provide over the Local Plan period, significant works would be required. Details of the works to the A27 were yet to be decided but from the scale of the likely solutions it was expected to cost in the region of £60m, whereas the funds available were estimated to be in the order of around a third of this figure. CDC had requested reduced housing targets in light of these significant issues and this had been refused. No additional funding for the A27 improvements was available. Finding sites within the district capable of accommodating the target number of houses without unacceptable impact on the A27 would be very challenging, consequently a new Local Plan is not expected to be adopted until 2023.

The Chairman said there was great concern about the pressure being put on the centre of Chichester and had asked how the Neighbourhood Plan should address this. The advice was not to look for more houses and to adhere to the city's original target of 300 houses over

the period of the Neighbourhood Plan likely to be accommodated within the Southern Gateway redevelopment site and/or other windfall sites around the parish.

Councillor Apel enquired of the cancellation of the recent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting and the Chairman confirmed that the PLACE meeting needed to be held prior to the next Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting so that updates from that meeting could be incorporated into any discussions. The John Pegg presentation, delayed from the previous Planning meeting could also be heard.

Councillor Quail and Councillor Gershater had attended a recent Planning training meeting and commented on the speaker who had said that the Neighbourhood Plan would have real relevance and would be very good for articulating enthusiasm and the wish of the community.

The Chairman said that the next meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on 27 September would aim to push on with developing policies.

Councillor Gaskin commented that it should be possible to negotiate either reduced housing targets or increased road infrastructure funding, and asked whether there was any room for negotiation. Discussions were ongoing with Highways England regarding funding available for the road infrastructure.

Councillor Apel questioned the uncertainty over housing numbers and the effect on any future medical facilities.

Councillor Apel mentioned with dismay the leading article in The Guardian about the sewage discharged by Southern Water into Chichester Harbour.

38 WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL DRAFT TRANSPORT PLAN 2022/2036 CONSULTATION

The Planning Adviser said that West Sussex County Council were holding a Webinar on 8 September 2021, further details of which could be found on their website should any member wish to attend.

The Planning Adviser, with the aid of a visual presentation, explained the background of the Draft Transport Plan 2022/2036 Consultation.

This included in summary:

- Vision: Including zero carbon by 2050, active transport, strategic routes.
- Objectives: Prosperous, Healthy, Protected and Connected.
- Strategies: Shared Transport, Active Travel Strategy, Access to Gatwick Airport Strategy, Road Network Strategy, Rail Strategy.

An action plan would be put together covering the next 5 years, although with no specific targets. This would be monitored and reviewed every 5 years. The direction of travel would also be monitored, to assess improvement or otherwise.

The Planning Adviser said that individual comments could be made by members, alternatively she could put together a response on the City Council's behalf. The consultation was taking place between 16 July and 8 October 2021.

Councillor Sharp was very concerned that there had still not been enough done to reach net carbon. Councillor Sharp felt that walking and cycling and active travel were not being prioritised quickly enough. She further commented that funding could be lost should this situation not be improved.

The Planning Adviser mentioned a separate Highways England consultation on the A259 Chichester to Emsworth Walking and Cycling Improvements. She showed a visual plan of the proposed improvements which included incorporating a three-metre-wide walking and cycling path along some routes. The Planning Adviser commented on the lack of provision for cyclists between Fishbourne and Chichester, a particularly dangerous route, where a fatality had occurred.

Councillor Quail commented with concern that pedestrians and cyclists on pavements did not mix, cycling lobbies were pressing hard on this issue. She further commented that Chem route ended at the pedestrian railway bridge due to the complexity of the route. Councillor Quail was concerned that this issue also needed to be addressed.

Councillor Apel commented on Fishbourne Road East planned new houses and the potential impact on traffic in the area.

Councillor Sharp said that should this plan be objected to that funding could be lost, she said she would prefer more favourable alternatives that were compliant to be suggested and to be more pragmatic and to try to address 'very well' some issues along part of the route.

The Chairman said there was a need to work with the community. After further discussion, he asked the Planning Adviser to respond to both consultations on behalf of the City Council.

Post Meeting Notes:

The Planning Adviser had sent the following response to the West Sussex County Council Draft Transport Plan:

- There must be a strong emphasis on sustainability and significant proposals to improve cycling and walking infrastructure and, so far as possible within your remit, public transport.
- There is a climate change emergency and the aim towards zero carbon by 2050 is noted, however the plan lacks any explanation of what would be required to achieve this or any detail about any actions to be taken towards this goal.
- The traffic flow problem on the A27 around Chichester is a significant issue which must be resolved as soon as possible. The 5 year action plan could include details of the steps required to bring about an agreement on what works are needed and then the process of how to get these works implemented.

The Planning Adviser had sent the following comments in response to the Highways England consultation:

- Cyclists and pedestrians should be provided separate paths for both their safety, however, most of the proposed route is shared with pedestrians.
- The route should continue into Chichester rather than stopping at the railway bridge, some distance from the city centre.

- There is a concern that cyclists, particularly those commuting to work, or cycling for sport, will not use the shared path because they do not wish to be hindered by pedestrians, vehicles exiting their drives, and stopping at every road junction to cross safely. Instead, they may continue to use the road, alongside vehicular traffic, with consequent risk to their safety given the narrower road (due to land take for the shared path) and drivers' expectations that cyclists will be off the road. This is likely to be the case unless all the junctions into the A259 on its northern side (or southern, if this has fewer junctions) can be changed to indicate priority to a continuous shared path; i.e. pedestrians and cyclists do not cross the roads, they have a continuous, uninterrupted priority route (coloured and raised to pavement level), which cars joining the A259 have to cross after carefully stopping and checking for cyclists and pedestrians.
- No provision is proposed along Fishbourne Road East as it is a "quiet route", but it may become a busier route due to planned residential developments around the area, such as the major development at White House Farm.
- The "quiet route" at Bosham is noted, however it is observed that cyclists tend to stay on road, taking the direct route, and directing cyclists along the quiet route means that there is no safe on-road provision for cyclists many of whom stick to the direct route across the roundabout. Directing cyclists elsewhere just means there is no provision for them on the busiest and most dangerous parts of the route. This is also the case for the quiet route provision at Fishbourne. Fishbourne is one of the busiest parts of the route, however no on-road provision, or even shared path is offered here for cyclists taking the direct route into Chichester as many do.
- It would be preferable to deliver a shorter route done well than the whole route done in a way that compromises both cyclists and pedestrians.

39 ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED ON AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

- Neighbourhood Plan – update
- White House Farm – update
- Local Plan
- A27 Noise issues

40 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 16 September 2021 at 2.00pm.

The meeting closed at 3.54pm.