



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Wednesday 17 January 2018 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mr R Hayes (Chairman), Mrs C Purnell (Vice-Chairman), Mrs J Duncton, Mr J F Elliott, Mr M Hall, Mr L Hixson, Mrs J Kilby, Mr S Oakley, Mr R Plowman, Mrs J Tassell and Mrs P Tull

**Members not present:** Mr G Barrett, Mr M Dunn, Mr G McAra and Mr D Wakeham

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present:** Mr J Bushell (Principal Planning Officer), Mr A Frost (Head of Planning Services), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services), Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer), Mrs F Stevens (Principal Planning Officer) and Mr T Whitty (Development Management Service Manager)

#### 112 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

Apologies were received from Mr Barrett, Mr Dunn and Mr Wakeham.

#### 113 **Approval of Minutes**

##### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2017 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### 114 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

#### 115 **Declarations of Interests**

Mrs Duncton declared a personal interest in respect of applications CC/17/02571/REM, SY/17/01458/DOM and WW/17/02592/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Mrs Duncton declared a personal interest in respect of application SDNP/17/01998/FUL as a West Sussex County Council appointed member of the South Downs National Park Authority.

Mr Hall declared a personal interest in respect of application CC/17/02571/REM as a former member of Graylingwell Cricket Club.

Mr Hixson declared a personal interest in respect of application CC/17/02571/REM as a member of Chichester City Council.

Mrs Kilby declared a personal interest in respect of application CC/17/02571/REM as a member of Chichester City Council.

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in respect of applications CC/17/02571/REM, SY/17/01458/DOM and WW/17/02592/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Mr Plowman declared a personal interest in respect of application CC/17/02571/REM as a member of Chichester City Council.

Mrs Purnell declared a personal interest in respect of applications CC/17/02571/REM, SY/17/01458/DOM and WW/17/02592/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council.

Mrs Purnell also declared a personal interest in respect of application SY/17/01458/DOM as a member of Selsey Town Council.

### **Planning Applications**

**(To listen to the speakers and the full debate of the planning applications follow the [link](#) to the online recording)**

The Committee considered the planning applications together with the agenda update sheet at the meeting detailing observations and amendments that had arisen subsequent to the despatch of the agenda. During the presentations by officers of the applications, members viewed photographs, plans, drawings and computerised images and artist impressions that were displayed on the screen.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the following decisions be made subject to the observations and amendments as set out below:-

#### **116 CC/17/02571/REM - Land South Of Graylingwell Drive, Chichester, West Sussex**

Information was reported on the agenda update sheet relating to additional third party objections from the University of Chichester and the residents of Penny Acre, further comments from West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) Highways and amended condition 2 regarding foundation details.

The Chairman explained that on this occasion the applicant and the agent would share three minutes.

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

- Mr P Evans – Chichester City Council Parish Representative
- Mr K Morgan – University of Chichester – Objector
- Mr P Harris - Objector
- Mr S Toplis – Agent
- Mr N Parkinson – Applicant

Mr Bushell presented the item and in response to members' comments and questions explained that with regard to concerns about overlooking of neighbouring properties on Graylingwell Park from the three flat blocks adjacent to Graylingwell Drive the developer had amended the site plans and moved the balconies to lessen this possibility. In terms of scale the three blocks had been deliberately positioned adjacent to the recently constructed three-storey blocks on the nearby Graylingwell development. The ridge heights of blocks 2, 3 and 4 had also been significantly reduced. Mr Bushell clarified that the minimum distance between the site and neighbouring properties at Penny Acre stood at 30 metres and in the case of blocks 2 and 4 significantly more than this across a tree-lined public highway which exceeded the Council's requirements. Officers were satisfied that the relationship would not be unneighbourly. With regard to the total number of flats, Mr Bushell clarified that if the number of flats were reduced and there was a proportionate increase in the number of 2 storey houses instead, this would result in the loss of some open space which would be to the detriment of the scheme as a whole. Mr Bushell confirmed that the affordable homes allocation remained at a policy compliant 30% and that the pepper-potting of these dwellings in three distinct groups across the site was acceptable. The previously anticipated 50% provision of starter homes on the site was not now planned to go ahead given the absence of government starter home legislation in this regard.

With reference to concerns about the appearance of the development, Mr Bushell reminded members that planning design is a subjective matter and that the use of a good quality stock brick in three different shades of red would provide a sufficient and acceptable level of variation. With regard to concerns over the darker boarding proposed on the flat blocks, officers agreed to add a further condition requiring a lighter shade of boarding to complement the surrounding landscape. Mr Bushell clarified that the screening buffer on the west site boundary with the University land would consist mainly of deciduous trees planted within the boundary of each garden. These gardens were at between 10 and 13 metres in length both meeting and exceeding the Council's minimum requirements. Within the context of an urban setting tree planting and fencing on the west site boundary was acceptable. Officers confirmed that there were no formal proposals before the Council for any re-development of the University land to the west of the site. Any future plans were therefore not material in the context of the current application.

Following a request to clarify the direction of traffic flow from the site Mr Bushell confirmed that the developer for the Graylingwell Park site would be installing bus gates at the west end of Graylingwell Drive and elsewhere within that site to prevent

traffic travelling west out of the site. All traffic from the development would access and exit the site via Kingsmead Avenue to the east. Mr Bushell also agreed to amend condition 3 with regard to the installation of electric vehicle charging points.

With reference to the cricket pavilion layout Mr Bushell confirmed that although there were no plans to provide changing facilities for officials the internal space could be adapted if necessary. There were no plans to provide any separate building for the storage of maintenance equipment but there would be ample space around the playing field for such a building if required in the future subject to planning permission.

Following concerns that the list of development plans included in the Committee papers and online were different Mr Frost reassured members that any variations were very minor and officers would ensure the latest versions were online.

Mrs Tassell proposed the application be deferred for further discussion between officers and the developer to redesign the site layout. Mr Plowman seconded the proposal which was not carried. A vote was taken on the officer recommendation to permit which was carried by the Chairman's casting vote.

Recommendation to **Permit** agreed.

The Committee took a short break.

117 **SY/17/01458/DOM - 11 Beach Gardens, Selsey, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 0HX**

This application had been deferred at the Planning Committee meeting held on 13 December 2017 for a site visit, which was held on 15 January 2017 in order to consider the impact of the proposed extension and alterations on the neighbouring properties and its impact on the surrounding area, including overlooking.

Information was reported on the agenda update sheet relating to the deletion of condition 1 and amended condition 3.

The following members of the public addressed the Committee:

- Mr C Alden – Selsey Town Council Parish Representative
- Mrs A Gaunt – Objector
- Ms E S Wikinson – Objector
- Mr G Mellett – Objector
- Mr John W Elliott – Chichester District Council member for Selsey South Ward

In response to members' comments and questions, Mr Whitty advised that officers had no concerns relating to the design of the building as the street scene was varied. With reference to a request to clarify the outside access he explained that there was no outside access from the Juliette balcony and the only access to the balcony terrace was from the living room. The outside staircase leading to the garden could be used as an outside access door however there was a front door

located off the main parking area to the north side of the site. With reference to further development Mr Whitty explained that condition 7 could be amended to remove permitted development rights which would include preventing the conversion of the flat roof to a balcony. With regard to overlooking it would be possible to add a condition to require a level of obscure glazing to be maintained on the terrace balcony. Mr Whitty explained that if members chose to request the removal of the spiral staircase access to the garden would be limited to bedroom one or bedroom three. With regard to the use of the garage Mr Whitty agreed to amend condition 6 to restrict the use to parking. With reference to concerns that the property would be used regularly for bed and breakfast Mr Whitty clarified that letting should not be considered a planning concern unless an applicant seeks to subdivide a property.

Some members maintained concerns regarding overlooking with reference to the revised upside down nature of the property and considered the removal of the outside spiral staircase, associated balcony and screening of the terrace balcony necessary.

Mrs Kilby proposed the deletion of the outside spiral staircase and associated balcony and the provision of a 1.8 metre high obscure glass screen on the eastern side of the eastern balcony. Mrs Purnell seconded the proposal. Mr Frost explained that if satisfactory amended plans were received, the application could be delegated to officers to determine. Members agreed to vote on each matter separately. A vote was taken for the deletion of the outside spiral staircase and associated balcony which was carried.

A vote was then taken for the provision of a 1.8 metre high obscure glass screen on the eastern side of the eastern balcony which was carried.

A final vote was taken to delegate the decision to officers to determine upon receipt of amended plans relating to the two matters above but in the event that such amended plans are not received the matter be referred back for Committee determination. This vote was also carried.

Delegate to officers to determine upon receipt of amended plans showing the deletion of the outside spiral staircase and associated balcony and the provision of a 1.8 metre high obscure glass screen on the eastern side of the eastern balcony.

(In the event that such amended plans are not received the application will be referred back for a Committee determination).

**118 WW/17/02592/FUL - Danbury, 56 Howard Avenue, West Wittering, PO20 8EU**

Information was reported on the agenda update sheet relating to further supporting information from the agent and two additional conditions.

The following member of the public addressed the Committee:

- Miss H Mccrudden – Agent

In response to members questions Mrs Stevens clarified that the site would I use foul mains drainage and the surface water drainage would be managed by soakaways to be agreed with Building Control. With regard to the parking allocation it was confirmed that the garage was included in the overall provision. Mrs Stevens agreed to amend condition 9 to read 'garages' rather than 'garage' and 'properties' rather than 'property'.

Defer for a Section 106 agreement then **Permit** agreed.

The Committee took a short break.

**119 SDNP/17/01998/FUL - Arun Cottage, The Street, Bury, RH20 1PA**

Information was reported on the agenda update sheet following receipt of additional Parish Council comments on the second revision of the application.

In response to members' comments and questions Mr Price explained that the building materials would consist mainly of stone with ironstone galetting, sandstone walling and a clay tiled roof. There would be at least one functioning chimney at the gable end of the building.

Mr Whitty explained that superseded plans had been included in the report due to a formatting error as a result of the nature of the recommendation not to contest the appeal. He would ensure the plans were either removed or clarified by an informative.

With regard to the applicant's decision to appeal, Mr Frost clarified that the applicant's amended plans had been submitted in November 2017 but they had since lodged an appeal on the grounds of non-determination of the application by the council. He explained that the appeal precluded the council from being able to permit or refuse the application and therefore the Committee could only indicate whether the application would have been permitted. Mr Frost confirmed that the resolution made by the Committee would be referred to the Planning Inspectorate.

**RESOLVED**

That the appeal lodged against non-determination of the application should not be contested by the council.

**120 Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

Mr Whitty drew attention to the agenda update sheet which detailed a number of amendments to the schedule of appeals.

The Committee noted the schedule of planning appeals, court and policy matters.

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

There were no late items.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: