

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 2 February 2022 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman),
Mr G Barrett, Mr B Brisbane, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs J Fowler,
Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers,
Mrs S Sharp and Mr P Wilding

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

14 **Agenda Update Sheet 02-02-22 (Pages 1 - 3)**

This page is intentionally left blank



Agenda Update Sheet

Planning Committee
Wednesday 2 February 2022

ITEM: 6

APPLICATION NO: 21/03119/ADV

COMMENT:

Update to Section 4.0 – History

Since the publication of the report, the full planning application relating to the physical works to the application site associated with its use as a restaurant, and an advert application relating to temporary hoarding around the shopfront have been permitted (on 27.01.2022 and 01.02.2022 respectively). As such, section 4.0 of the report is amended as follows:

21/03118/FUL	PCO PER	Internal and external alterations, including alterations to shopfront, outdoor seating area including awnings and placement of tables/chairs/planters, installation of roof lanterns, installation of plant equipment and installation and display of advertisements.
21/03532/ADV	PER	Erection of temporary hoarding on the front elevation of the building.

ITEM: 7

APPLICATION NO: 22/00020/NMA

COMMENT:

Amendment to proposal

The proposal to alter the eastern side of the northern (front) boundary wall (c.ii in Committee Report) has been removed from the current scheme. Amended plans have been received to reflect these changes.

Revised plans

Additional consultee comment received

WSSC Highways:

The proposals relate to the removal of brick walls and canopies and wall design. From the LHA's perspective there appears to be no changes to the overall access strategy and previously agreed vehicular movements. Our previous comments would therefore still apply to the latest application.

Additional representations received

8 additional objections have been received, concerning:

- a) Concern about the northern boundary treatment.
- b) Disapprove of the appearance of railings, which open-up the view across the site.
- c) The buildings are more suited to an agricultural setting.
- d) Proposal to construct matching boundary treatment, will present a totally different vista and be an unsightly blot on the streetscape.
- e) Concern regarding impact on heritage assets.
- f) The estate will have a very industrial appearance which is totally unacceptable to its near neighbours and not in-keeping with the surrounding residential area.
- g) The northern boundary wall should be made higher or the existing one remain unchanged.
- h) The wall alongside the cemetery footpath should be kept.
- i) Vertically clad buildings are visually inferior to the horizontal cladding and results in a radical change to the industrial buildings.
- j) Query whether a private enterprise would have received the same favourable support for such radical changes.
- k) Availability of materials and funding issues should not be issues affecting the assessment of the aesthetic impact of proposed changes.
- l) Application should be treated as a 'material' amendment involving the whole appearance of the Industrial Estate, especially as seen through the proposed boundary treatment along Westhampnett Road.
- m) A section of open railings does not provide any acoustic protection. Removal or lowering of wall will have an adverse effect on the quality of life due to noise intrusion.

ITEM: 8

APPLICATION NO: 21/01797/FUL

COMMENT:

Additional representations received

Parish Council (21.01.2022):

The Parish Council repeats its original objections but would add to this as follows:

When the original application was permitted, it was for ten houses and the original dwelling was to be refurbished or demolished and rebuilt. To put in an application for two houses shows scant regard for the planning process or the wellbeing of the local residents, particularly those who purchased homes at Greenacre in good faith.

There is no identified need for larger than average dwellings to be built on this site.

We reiterate that we think there should be like for like and therefore one three bed house built.

Additional third party representation received

One additional objection has been received, concerning:

- a) The site is argued as a separate windfall site, however if permitted there would be 12 houses on one windfall site, for which there is a maximum of 10 allowed.
- b) The committee report has omitted to set out the whole of Policy LP1
- c) The support offered by this policy is dependent on each individual site, and does not override the other parts of the Local Plan but rather is subservient to them
- d) Poor development should not be approved because it is a Windfall site
- e) This proposal is for two large properties constrained on a small site
- f) The site is within the Chichester Harbour AONB
- g) While one of the properties is a 4bed, and one is a 3bed they are very similar in size
- h) limits the garden space around the properties
- i) pushes the building line to the west
- j) The developer promised residents that there would be only one property on this plot

ITEM: 9

APPEALS, COURT AND POLICY MATTERS

6. COURT AND OTHER MATTERS

High Court Matters

Site – Land at Bethwines Farm and South of Ivy Lodge, West of Blackboy Lane, Fishbourne.

Matter – Appellant's challenge of PINS decision letter dated 4th October 2021

Stage – Application lodged 22nd November 2021 and defence filed on behalf of PINS on 23rd December 2021. Permission to pursue the challenge refused by the Court on 19th January 2022.

This page is intentionally left blank