

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Head of Finance and Governance Services

Contact: Katherine Davis or Lisa Higenbottam
Email: kdavis@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 13 December 2017 at 9.30 am**

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

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

15 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**

The Planning Committee will consider any late items announced by the Chairman at the start of this meeting (agenda item 3) as follows:

- a) Items added to the agenda papers and made available for public inspection
- b) Items which the chairman has agreed should be taken as matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances to be reported at the meeting

17 **Agenda Update Sheet** (Pages 1 - 4)



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee
Wednesday 13 December 2017

ITEM: 6

APPLICATION NO: SY/17/01458/DOM

COMMENT:

Further Third Party (Objection) Comments Received

1 further letter of objection detailing the following matters has been received:

- a) Erroneous floor space calculations submitted by agent
- b) Details of development of works on site including dates
- c) Omission of other properties to the north in Officer's reports
- d) List of rooms in report omits TV room, utility room, dressing room, lobby and hall
- e) Additional history to the site
- f) Questions over whether application proposes re-build or extension

ITEM: 8

APPLICATION NO: SI/17/01059/FUL

COMMENT:

The application has been withdrawn by the applicant.

ITEM: 9

APPLICATION NO: KD/15/03367/FUL

COMMENT:

Additional Parish Council comments

We wonder how much more of the applicant's behaviour you are willing to tolerate! Firstly, they have failed to comply with the spirit of the planning committee decision on the 11th October; although present at the meeting on the 2nd November, they brought nothing to it which could move our discussions forward, secondly, and most notably, their latest position as expressed by their agent, Mr Paul White, does nothing but frankly insult the planning process and ignore all policies!

The Parish is appalled at the applicant's determination to find shortcuts at the cost of our Neighbourhood plan rather than working with it. The applicant's new position of "no phasing" is now bordering on bullying by a company with group revenues of £747.9M, clearly wishing to do away with published policies and the wishes of local communities to protect shareholder returns and, I quote from Mr Webber's letter "Operating practices of volume house builders".

It is clear to us that the applicant is seeking to set a legal precedence with this decision. At risk is quite simply the national position in relation to Neighbourhood Plans. Helpfully, I am sure you will agree, their latest position leaves no other option than to recommend to the committee that the application be REJECTED.

Further supporting information from the applicant

Further information has been sent to Members of the Planning Committee in the form of two page information pack, outlining the benefits that the proposals would bring forward and why phasing of the site would be inappropriate.

Amendment to condition 3

No development shall commence unless and until a Phasing Scheme which sets out the sequence in which the proposed buildings, car parking, internal vehicular and pedestrian access routes (including links to and beyond the site boundary), SUDS infrastructure, landscaping, overhead cable re-routing and public and other open space will be provided or carried out has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt the Scheme shall be based on a five year development programme comprising two phases with a minimum period of 28 months between phases. The development shall thereafter not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved Scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To comply with the terms of the application and to ensure consideration is given to the development as a whole in the interests of ensuring the timely delivery of an appropriate mix of housing, other uses and open space during the construction of the development.

ITEM: 10

APPLICATION NO: EWB/17/01722/FUL

COMMENT:

Amendment to condition 1

The use of the site shall be for the accommodation of agricultural workers and ancillary support staff only and shall be for a limited period of 1 year from the date of this permission, at the end of which time the site shall be restored to its original condition or to a condition to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: Permission would not normally be granted for such development in this location but in granting permission exceptionally for a temporary period the Local Planning Authority have had regard to the particular circumstances relating to the proposal.

Note: For the purposes of this condition agricultural workers are defined as those persons employed solely in agriculture as defined in Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

ITEM: 12

APPLICATION NO: CC/14/01018/OUT

COMMENT:

Amended location plan



Clarification of Recommendation

For the avoidance of doubt the Committee is being asked to permit the outline masterplan application which it originally resolved to permit in December 2014 subject to completion of a section 106 agreement. The difference is that the application is now for a lower number of dwellings (218 as opposed to 391) because separate 'full' or 'reserved matters' permissions in the interim have reduced the balance of dwellings remaining to be built by 173 (i.e. 391-218=173). The overall total of 785 dwellings at Graylingwell Park is unchanged. The content of the section 106 agreement has necessarily been revised to reflect the reduced balance of remaining dwellings and the original triggers revised. The changes to the s.106 deliver the same infrastructure benefits as before and the document has now been agreed by all parties.

ITEM: 14 Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters:-

6, COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

HIGH COURT. – Land at River Farm, Brookfield Lane, Tillington, Petworth

Planning Inspectorate decision letter dated 12th September 2017 relating to an enforcement appeal, which was dismissed and the enforcement notice upheld, is being challenged by the Appellant. The enforcement notice relates to a breach of a condition requiring caravans on the land to only be occupied by seasonal agricultural workers and requires the cessation of occupation of caravans by non seasonal workers and the removal of such caravans. A permission hearing was held on 28th November 2017 and the court granted permission for the matter to proceed on one of the five grounds pleaded. The matter will now proceed to a full hearing on the ground that the Inspector did not consider, or did not give adequate reasons for not considering, the Appellants mitigation measures (landscaping) when deciding whether planning permission should be granted for the unauthorised development.

Correction

Under 'Court Hearings' the second sentence of text in the column headed 'Stage' should read;

Request for compliance with Court's Directions of August 2017 to be postponed made by The Council in agreement with the Defendants in October 2017.