

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Katherine Jeram or Lisa Higenbottam
Email: kjeram@chichester.gov.uk or
lhigenbottam@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of **Planning Committee** will be held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on **Wednesday 1 February 2017 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr R Hayes (Chairman), Mrs J Kilby (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mr M Cullen, Mrs J Duncton, Mr M Dunn, Mr J F Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mr L Hixson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr R Plowman, Mrs C Purnell, Mrs J Tassell and Mrs P Tull

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

19 **Agenda Update Sheet** (Pages 1 - 6)



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee

Wednesday 1 February 2017

ITEM 5: ROWAN NURSERY, BELL LANE, BIRDHAM

APPLICATION NO: 16/03354/FUL

This application was withdrawn by the applicant on 24 January 2017.

ITEMS 6, 7, 8, 10 & 11

The Committee is asked to note that on 1 February 2017 the Council is introducing a new style of decision notice; grouping conditions by their respective requirements. As such the order of conditions printed in the agenda may be subject to change on any final decision notice.

ITEM 8: WINDMILL BUNGALOW, DONNINGTON

APPLICATION NO: 16/01468/FUL

CORRECTIONS

Page 54; para 8.6 (line 17) “..and plot 7”.

Page 57; para 8.23 (line 1): plots 9-13 instead of plots 10-14

Page 57; para 8.23 (line 3) plots 14-16 instead of plots 15-17

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

5 additional third party objections have been received, expressing the following concerns and comments in respect of:

- Loss of light, privacy and noise disturbance;
- Overlooking towards the rear garden of The Aylings;
- Density and design out of character with the area;
- Lack of precedent for 2.5 storey dwellings;

- Increased traffic and noise;
- Adverse visual impact on the area with buildings of greater elevation;
- No improvements or upgrades to existing road infrastructure;
- Loss of light towards no's 45 and 47 Waterside Drive;
- The housing allocation for Donnington is already met for the Plan period;
- The pedestrian access onto Queen's Avenue should be available for all residents.

Officer Comments: For clarification, the amended scheme reduces the number of dwellings from 17 to 16 dwellings, additional visitor parking is proposed and there is an increase in public open space. Plot 5 is re-oriented to face onto the parking court, with the private garden re-located to the side. Plot 7 is now proposed to be a 4 bed unit and incorporates a front dormer window. Vehicle tracking is submitted to demonstrate adequate turning and manoeuvring within the site for refuse vehicles. An updated Viability Summary is provided and a commuted sum of £250,000 is to be secured for off-site affordable housing provision.

Objection from Donnington Parish Council, raising the following concerns:

Donnington Parish Council considered the amendments to this planning application at a meeting of its Planning Committee held on 30th January 2017. It would wish to make the following comments in respect of the application:

OBJECTION

The following include minor changes to our previous objections relating to Density. Our objections relating to Access Arrangements and Loss of Light are unchanged

ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS

1. The Applicant's Design and Access Statement page 6 states "The main vehicular access into the site is currently from Queens Avenue with a secondary entrance from Waterside Drive which connects to the A27, Chichester By-pass, at the Stockbridge roundabout. Existing pedestrian access is from both Queens Avenue and Waterside Drive."

The Parish Council asks the Authority to note that from the existing vehicular access in Queens Avenue a right turn provides direct access and egress to the A27 in just 80 yards, thus creating no real traffic problems on the Manhood Peninsula.

For some unstated reason, this application proposes switching vehicular access from Queens Avenue to Waterside Drive. Access from Waterside Drive involves driving through the estate to Grosvenor Road (already double parked daily) and then trying to access the busy A286 Stockbridge Road to be able to get to the A27 or the Peninsula

Stockbridge Road, being the only 'A' road connecting the peninsula, already has a severe congestion problem to which this application will add.

2. According to the applicant the TRICS data suggests an addition of 0.8% to the existing traffic flow on the A286 and is not considered to have a material impact on the local road network..

The Parish Council note this, but state that all development applications in the locality say the same and consider that 0.8% from this application in addition to all of the recent applications of say 0.8%, 1.2% , 1% etc.etc.etc. have a SEVERE cumulative congestion impact on the A286, notwithstanding failed air quality.

The Parish Council intend contacting the District Council and requesting the cumulative impact of all developments over the past few years on the A286 Stockbridge Road traffic and air quality situation, which we also think the District Council Planning Members should see.

3. In view of all of the above the Parish Council can see no logic in this application proposing Waterside Drive as the vehicular access to create even more A286 traffic rather than the existing access onto Queens Avenue which gives direct access to the A27 in just 80 yards.

We object most strongly to the access proposals

DENSITY

The initial proposal was for 9 dwellings.

However the District Council said that this was considered to be underdevelopment of the site, without apparently any declared consideration of traffic impact.

The next proposal was for 15 dwellings – but this was considered too dense, and “If a reduction in the number of dwellings to around 11 or 12 could be achieved then the feeling of openness and space to the development would be greatly enhanced.”

But we now have a proposed development of 16 dwellings.

The Parish Council do not consider this to be understandable and also consider that 16 dwellings on this site is still too dense

We object to the density in this proposal

LOSS OF LIGHT

We also object on the grounds of loss of light to adjacent properties

CONCLUSION

Whilst the Parish Council is not against development of this site, in the interests of our community, WE MUST OBJECT TO THIS APPLICATION.

ITEM 9: GREENACRES NURSERY, SIDLESHAM

APPLICATION NO: 16/02036/FUL

CORRECTION

Page 69; para 1.0 – correction to first paragraph of printed minutes removing the word ‘though’.

ITEM 10: LAND AT ST JAMES FARM, SIDLESHAM

APPLICATION NO: SI/16/03699/COU

AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 3

The camping activity hereby approved shall not be carried out other than:

- (1) on the land as defined by the Location Plan (Drawing 001); and
- (2) between the first Monday preceding the UK Bank Holiday of Good Friday and 1 October in any calendar year.

Outside of these dates all vehicles and temporary structures (excluding the Shepherd huts) shall be dismantled and removed from the site. The Shepherds huts shall be stored in accordance with details approved under condition 4.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION 11

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) the proposed campsite (including Shepherds huts) shall be used for holiday accommodation only and shall not be used for any individual's main or sole residential dwelling and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes)(Amendment)(England) Order 2015, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and reenacting that Order). A register of all occupiers, detailing dates, names and usual addresses, shall be maintained by the owner and shall be kept up to date and available for inspection at all reasonable hours by the Local Planning Authority. Any occupation of the campsite (including Shepherds huts) by a single party for a consecutive period exceeding 1 month shall be required to provide evidence of their place of primary accommodation.

Reason: To ensure that the campsite (including Shepherds huts) is only used as holiday / tourist accommodation, since the site lies within an area where additional residential properties would not normally be permitted.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION 12

The campsite shall provide for no more than 24 pitches in total, which shall include no more than 4 Shepherds huts.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and to ensure that the campsite does not result in an intensification of the use of the land harmful to the rural character of the area.

ITEM 11: ENBOURNE BUSINESS PARK, SELSEY ROAD, SIDLESHAM

APPLICATION NO: SI/16/03631/FUL

DELETION OF CONDITION 1

Work has now started on site and as such the current application is retrospective. Condition 1 on page 110 of the agenda is no longer required and is removed from the recommendation.

ITEM 12: INGLEWOOD, ITCHENOR ROAD, WEST ITCHENOR

APPLICATION NO: WI/16/03543/FUL

CORRECTION

Page 113 – Recommendation is to **REFUSE**

ITEM 13: LAND WEST OF 41 PARSONAGE ESTATE

APPLICATION NO: SDNP/16/04212/FUL

AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 12

Before the development hereby permitted is begun, a scheme of works showing the proposed means of foul water disposal including all necessary on-site and off-site works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The chosen scheme should be limited to Option A or B as shown on the plan entitled 'Sewer Records Page 1 of 2' submitted 18th January 2017 and/or an upgrade to the existing pumping station. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied the approved scheme shall be carried out and completed in full accordance with the details shown in the scheme. The responsibility for securing all necessary agreements and permits from the landowner or other party shall rest with the developer.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development is satisfactorily drained.

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION COMMENTS

ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER

Most of the trees are being retained and the proposed protective fencing seems adequate.

Landscape condition is required to soften/enhance the proposed development.