

# 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 27 March 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

18 **Agenda Update Sheet 27-03-2024** (Pages 1 - 3)

This page is intentionally left blank



# Agenda Update Sheet

## Planning Committee

### Wednesday 27 March 2024

#### ITEM 8

**PLANNING APPLICATION: 23/02901/FUL**

**COMMENT:**

The applicant has signed and returned the Unilateral Undertaking, at the time of writing the payment has not been received.

Amended Recommendation

RECOMMENDATION TO DEFER FOR S106 THEN PERMIT

---

#### ITEM: 9

**APPLICATION NO: 22/00593/FUL**

**COMMENT:**

On 4 October 2023 the Planning Committee resolved to defer the application for S106 and then permit. The S.106 agreement was completed on the 26 January 2024. The S.106 agreement was completed on the 26 January 2024, but the decision notice has not yet been issued.

Amended Recommendation

The Committee is asked to note the contents of this report and endorse the resolution of the 4 October 2023 Planning Committee, and permit with S106 subject to the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 and as amended by the Update Sheet.

Amended Condition

1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of ~~three~~ **two** years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

---

**ITEM 10:**

**PLANNING APPLICATION:23/01952/FUL**

**COMMENT:**

A committee note for the 27<sup>th</sup> March 2024 has been submitted which provides the applicants response to the points raised in the previous committee meeting. The note summarises the highways comments received and the transport technical note which has been submitted.

---

**ITEM 13: Chichester District Council Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

**COMMENT:**

Court Matters:

Land East of Farmfield Nurseries: Not Guilty plea entered. Trial on 22 May at Worthing Magistrates' Court

Crouchlands – Lagoon 3: Appeal lodged against conviction and sentence. Waiting for the appeal hearing date

Land South of the Stables: Warrant with bail was executed. Defendant directed to attend court on 26 March for plea to be entered.

82a Fletchers Lane: Not Guilty Plea entered. Trial on 27 June at Worthing Magistrates' Court.

---

**ITEM 14: South Downs National Park Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

**COMMENT:**

Appeal decision for SDNP/23/00351/HOUS:

“The site benefits from extant planning permission<sup>1</sup> for a development of similar form and appearance which would provide additional living accommodation, thus fulfilling the same purpose as the appeal proposal. The design of the proposed two-storey extension differs from the permitted scheme and therefore my reasoning focusses upon this element of the proposal....The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the Midhurst Conservation Area... The appeal site is situated outside the medieval town in a character area comprising late nineteenth and twentieth-century suburbs. The CA Appraisal classifies Carron Lane as a suburban lane with no pedestrian footway, peripheral to the principal routes and built at a lower density. The appeal property is contemporary with the stretches of late Victorian and Edwardian suburban housing which dominate the character area, and from its large plot size, reflects the area’s low-density pattern of development....The roof ridge and eaves of the proposed two-storey extension would be level with the main dwelling’s ridge and eaves, providing a uniform appearance between the extension and existing dwelling. The scale, form and massing of the extension would reflect the existing hipped-roofed two-storey front projection. The design of the proposed extension would therefore compliment the character of the main dwelling....The proposal would not alter the historic plan form and relationship to topographic features from which the significance of the CA is derived. The CA Appraisal advises that the character of period suburban houses be retained through the preservation of their original features. The proposal would preserve original features of value and, as set out above, the design of the proposal would reflect the character of the existing building. The proposal would not therefore detract from the dominance of Victorian and Edwardian houses within the suburban lanes. The proposal would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the CA, and its effects on the CA’s significance would be neutral....For the reasons given above, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and CA....In addition, the proposal would satisfy LP Policy SD1 which echoes the first of the statutory purposes of the National Park in requiring proposals to conserve and enhance the cultural heritage of the area. The proposal would not harm, and thus would conserve the scenic quality, tranquillity, and dark skies of the National Park...For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan taken as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.”

This page is intentionally left blank