

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Fiona Baker on 01243 534609

Email: fbaker@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 17 April 2024 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr C Todhunter (Chairman), Mr J Cross (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Bates, Mr D Betts, Mr R Briscoe, Mr J Brookes-Harmer, Ms B Burkhart, Mrs H Burton, Mrs D Johnson, Mr S Johnson, Mr H Potter, Ms S Quail and Mrs S Sharp

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

20 **Agenda Update Sheet 17-04-2024** (Pages 1 - 3)

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee

Wednesday 17 April 2024

ITEM: 6

APPLICATION NO: 23/00067/FUL

COMMENT:

Response from CDC Tree Officer:

No objection. There are no trees at the site the subject of a TPO and the site is not within a Conservation Area. Given the existing ditch is usually wet the tree roots will not have meaningfully penetrated it.

Response from WSCC Local Highway Authority:

No objection. The applicant has now addressed the outstanding matter regarding the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

ITEM 8

PLANNING APPLICATION: 23/02463/FUL

COMMENT:

A revised Proposed Site Plan has been received.

Details	Reference	Version	Date Received	Status
PLAN - EXISTING LOCATION PLAN	2311NE_R0_F S_000		27.10.2023	Approved

PLAN - Proposed Site plan	FS 002	REV 001	15.04.2024	Approved
PLAN - Location Plan	FS 003	REV 000	14.11.2023	Approved
PLAN – Proposed Elevations	FS 004	REV 000	14.11.2023	Approved
PLAN - PROPOSED VEHICLE ACCESS	2311NE_R0	000	20.02.2024	Approved

ITEM 14

PLANNING APPLICATION: 23/02921/FUL

COMMENT:

This item is withdrawn from the agenda for further investigation and consideration of drainage matters.

ITEM 15

COMMENT:

In response to question 5a) as detailed within Appendix 1 to the report it is recommended that the response be amended to include the following:

Complex major applications frequently involve consultations with a range of stakeholders, and it can take time for matters to be resolved; particularly in respect of infrastructure issues where a solution needs to be established by the statutory undertaker/consultee. In addition, these applications often require S106 planning obligations involving a range of parties including the County Council, District Council and a number of landowners. Whilst the Council's legal team can be sufficiently resourced to progress a legal agreement, it is not within our power to limit the time taken by other parties to complete their part in the complex process. These matters are therefore outside of the control of the Local Planning Authority. Therefore the proposal to impose a 10 week time limit on major commercial applications would unreasonably penalise the local planning authority for poor performance when delays would likely be outside of the control of the Local Planning Authority.

ITEM 17: South Downs National Park Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

COMMENT:

Appeal decision for SDNP/22/03527/FUL

“I observed that the Main Barn, described in the submitted Planning, Design and Access Statement³ as being a concrete framed structure, lacked walls on its southern elevation above the adjacent ground level. The eastern elevation also contains 3 large gaps, which are devoid of walls. It is clear from this that a considerable amount of works to the Main Barn would be required for it to effectively function as a residential dwelling.....All-in-all, whilst the Main Barn would not be extended and its overall structure and form would remain the same, the amount of works involved would amount to its substantial reconstruction....The appellant has stated that the provision of affordable housing would not be practical or viable, but no details have been provided to substantiate this assertion. Accordingly, I find that it has not been shown that the use of the Main Barn for affordable housing would be either unviable or unachievable. In these circumstances, the proposed development would conflict with Part 1. g) of Policy SD41, which lists a cascade of viable uses for buildings proposed to be converted.... I therefore find that the proposed development would not comply with relevant development plan policies relating to the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings outside of defined settlement boundaries to an alternative use....The proposed development would involve the insertion of large areas of glazing on both the western and eastern elevations of the Main Barn, a modern structure which is currently in a poor state of repair. As shown in the Landscape Masterplan, a considerable proportion of the area around the buildings to be converted would be composed of hardstanding, including permeable reinforced gravel and sandstone slabs. Residential properties in plots stemming from West Burton Road are present further to the north of the site. These are well-designed and attractive buildings. The Main Barn as converted would bear little resemblance to these properties in terms of its architectural design...the above-mentioned works would significantly formalise and domesticise the appearance of the site, even taking account of the fact that the existing cables across the site would be placed underground. This would erode much of the site’s informal and agricultural appearance which presently significantly contributes to the rural character of the area....I therefore find that the proposed development would not conserve and enhance the landscapes of the National Park....

This page is intentionally left blank