



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Virtually on Wednesday 3 June 2020 at 9.30 am

**Members Present:** Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp, Mr A Sutton and Mr P Wilding

**Members not present:**

**In attendance by invitation:**

**Officers present:** Mr T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Miss J Bell (Development Manager (Majors and Business)), Ms H Chivers (Planning Policy Officer), Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Mr S Harris (Principal Planning Officer), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Miss S Hurr (Democratic Services Officer), Mr M Mew (Principal Planning Officer), Mr J Saunders (Development Manager (National Park)), Mr S Shaw (County Highways (Development Management) Team Manager), Mrs F Stevens (Development Manager (Applications)) and Mr T Whitty (Divisional Manager for Development Management)

## 76 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed everyone present to the virtual meeting, and confirmed that item 8 – SDNP/20/01019/FUL, Copse Cottage, Norwood Lane, East Lavington, Petworth had been withdrawn from the agenda.

## 77 **Urgent Items**

The Chairman reported that there would be one urgent item: Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing, which would be taken as the final item on the agenda.

## 78 **Declarations of Interests**

Rev Bowden declared a personal interest in respect of planning application CC/19/03146/REM as a member of Chichester City Council.

Mrs Johnson declared a personal interest in respect of planning application SY/20/00605/FUL as a member of Selsey Town Council.

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications CC/19/03146/REM and SDNP/19/04090/FUL as member of West Sussex County Council.

Mr Potter declared a personal interest in respect of planning application SDNP/19/04090/FUL as an appointed member of South Downs National Park Authority.

Mrs Purnell declared a personal interest in respect of planning applications CC/19/03146/REM and SDNP/19/04090/FUL as member of West Sussex County Council, and SY/20/00605/FUL as a member of Selsey Town Council.

Mrs Sharp declared a person interest in respect of planning application CC/19/03146/REM as a member of Chichester City Council and a member of Chichester and District Cycling Forum.

**79 CC/19/03146/REM - Land On The West Side Of Broyle Road, Chichester West**

Mr Harris presented the item to Members and drew attention to the information provided in the Update Sheet.

The Committee received the following speakers:

- Philip Maber – Objector
- Gabrielle Adams – Objector
- Mark Record – Objector
- Rob Collett – Agent (written statement read out)

Mr Harris then responded to Members' comments and questions. He explained that the layout of the dwellings followed the perimeter block approach principle, with one street of dwellings backing onto Centurion Way. The layout had been subject to various improvements during the course of the application. He also confirmed that the Housing Officer preferred the changes which had been made, which involved an increased number of affordable dwellings. Planning guidance had been followed although this parcel provided 27% affordable dwellings as opposed to 30% which would be compensated for in other parcels. Photovoltaic provision was included for those dwellings with roofs within the appropriate degree of facing south, and purchasers of other dwellings would be advised of the option to pay for photovoltaic panels to be installed. The applicants have publically committed to provide a further cycleway link to Centurion Way as part of the Reserved Matters application for the residential parcel to the south of the site, and Mr Harris confirmed it would not be reasonable for the Council to pursue further such provision as part of the current application.

Mr Harris further responded that a specific hedge height could not be conditioned and there would be a requirement to replant within five years if necessary. A management company would take responsibility for the maintenance of all landscaping outside of individual properties' curtilages, but to require planting to be maintained at a specific height in perpetuity would not be reasonable or enforceable.

With regards the 'start' or 'commencement' dates for the proposals, Miss Golding confirmed these were listed within the outline planning permission.

Mr Shaw responded to questions confirming the 2007 adopted Manual for Streets remains the relevant guidance. With regards to the 4.8 metre carriageway widths, and the issue with cars parked on pavements, there was previously a desire to reduce car ownership which was believed would be achieved by reducing parking facilities, but this resulted in cars being parked on streets. The allocation and level of parking facilities on this parcel were considered suitable, with significant on street parking not expected, and therefore it was believed the balance of carriageway width and parking facilities was appropriate.

Mr Whitty responded that work on cycleway and pedestrian access had not been undertaken at a late stage, but developed over a number of years. With regards to the access to the north, there were a number of engineering issues associated with the differing levels on the site, and considerations were not just linked to costs but also to appearance, and where mature trees were currently established. Developers were working within the parameters set out in the outline permission, and to the south of the parcel a good solution had been suggested and an informative could be added to the decision in order to ensure this was provided. Although the access to the north was desirable, it had presented significant difficulties with the depth of cutting onto Centurion Way. Mr Whitty added that the layout grouped affordable houses back to back, but facing onto different roads. Housing associations preferred some grouping for maintenance purposes, and the proposed layout provided for good social cohesion.

Mr Harris responded that design was a subjective matter, and that the design on this parcel was consistent with other parcels and the approved residential design strategy.

Mr Whitty explained that he did not have the precise wording for the proposed informative relating to the future provision of a cycle link, but the essence of this would include 'that the developer was expected to fully investigate and implement wherever possible the indicative access to parcel 3i as part of developing the proposals'. Mr Harris added that discussions had taken place with the Local Highway Authority regarding achieving the link with Centurion Way and there were unlikely to be any constraints in terms of the procedures in realising this undertaking. Mr Whitty confirmed this would be added to officers' recommendation.

In a vote Members agreed the recommendation.

Recommendation to **Permit** agreed with additional conditions, informatives and amendments as discussed.

Members took a ten minute break.

Mr Mew presented the item to Members and drew attention to the information provided in the Update Sheet.

In a vote Members agreed the recommendation.

Recommendation to **Permit** agreed.

81 **SY/20/00605/FUL - Selsey Country Club, Golf Links Lane, Selsey, Chichester**

Mr Mew presented the item to Members and drew attention to the information provided in the Update Sheet.

The Committee received the following speakers:

- Mike Sully – Parish Council (written statement read out)
- Lucan Daniell – Applicant (written statement read out)
- Timothy Johnston – CDC Member

Mr Mew then responded to Member's comments and questions. He confirmed that there was a current permission for a marquee in the existing location, and that details had not been submitted regarding a landscaping scheme. In reference to hardstanding this may not be required, as there was currently a path, but details had not been submitted on this matter and the application also did not provide information concerning parking arrangements. There was an existing temporary events licence, and currently there were no restrictions on the previous planning conditions regarding the number of events, and it would be unreasonable to introduce such restrictions, were the proposed application granted. The application was for events taking place between 1<sup>st</sup> April and 30<sup>th</sup> September. In relation to ensuring only one marquee was in place, a condition could be added to state this requirement, were the proposed application granted. Mr Mew added that hedging could be added within the blue line shown on the plan.

Mr Whitty summarised the officers' recommendation to refuse the application, which followed a similar refusal, explaining this was not a straight-forward recommendation. Officers must make a recommendation, and on balance the proposed location was considered more harmful, and there was an existing permitted location. Mr Whitty listed the options available to the Committee which included the option to refuse as officers had recommended, permit or permit with conditions, or if there were particular concerns regarding the landscaping, hardstanding and car parking then a deferral would be more appropriate.

The Chairman then proposed that application be deferred for further details and negotiation regarding the landscaping (including paths) around the site and the car parking provision. This was seconded by Mr Sutton.

In a vote Members agreed the proposal to defer.

Decision to be **Deferred** pending further details and negotiation.

The Committee took a five minute break.

82 **SDNP/19/04090/FUL & SDNP/19/04091/LIS - Sandhill House, Nyewood Road, Rogate, GU31 5HU**

Mr Saunders presented the item to Members and drew attention to the information provided in the Update Sheet.

The Committee received the following speaker:

- Graham Tucker– Objector (written statement read out)

Mr Saunders then responded to Member's comments and questions. He explained the wall was listed due to its attachment to the wall surrounding Sandhill House which was a listed building. With regards to highway safety, the revised visibility splays, which to the south were 14.2 metres and to the north 12.7 metres, added an extra 7 metres in each direction, which although does not meet the standard, is an improvement as recognised by West Sussex County Council, which was supportive of this proposal. He also confirmed a convex mirror was in situ and that the current access does not allow a vehicle to pull off the highway before proceeding through the gates, which would be mitigated in the proposed access. The closing of the existing access was conditioned if permission was granted, by use of bollards and a chain-linked fence which was considered the most appropriate due to it being an attractive feature in relation to the listed building.

Mr Saunders further responded that the site was currently unplanted and the proposal included planting of a native species hedgerow directly behind the listed building boundary wall. The site would also be planted with fruit trees to reinstate the original orchard use. With regards to the wall and its relationship with the listed building, there was a significant parcel of land between the two and therefore the proposed alterations would have limited impacts on the listed building. The conservation officer had confirmed that this was not the most significant part of the listed wall, and part of the wall had fallen-down, and could be instated as part of the proposals. The conclusion was that the proposal was of limited harm to the significance of the wall. Mr Saunders also confirmed that West Sussex County Council had asked for the height of the wall to be reduced to 0.9 metres to allow a driver see above it, and 'grasscrete' surface would be installed for the track. A condition had also been included that the proposed access would not be used until the existing access was closed, in accordance with the plans and details submitted.

In a vote Members agreed the recommendations.

Recommendation to **Permit** both agreed with additional conditions, informatives and amendments as discussed.

Members took a thirty minute lunch break.

83 **SDNP/20/01019/FUL- Copse Cottage, Norwood Lane, East Lavington, Petworth, GU28 0QG**

This item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

**84 Chichester District Council Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

Mrs Stevens presented the item to members and drew attention to the information provided in the Update Sheet.

Mrs Stevens explained that with regards to 19/02407/PA3Q – Land South of 102A First Avenue, Almodington, Batchmere, the Inspector had agreed that one of the proposed agricultural buildings was too small to function as a dwelling.

Mrs Stevens explained that with regards to 18/00187/CONMHC – Fisher Granary, Fisher Lane, South Mundham, the Inspector had increased the permitted time period to remove a mobile home, outbuilding and decking from three months to nine months to take into consideration the issues and constraints associated with the current Covid-19 pandemic.

Members agreed to note this item.

**85 South Downs National Park Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters**

Members agreed to note this item.

**86 Late Item: Draft Interim Policy Statement for Housing**

Miss Chivers presented the item to Members and drew attention to the information provided in the Update Sheet.

Mr Ayling then responded to Member's comments and questions. He explained that the calculation of housing need was undertaken with reference to Government standard methodology but this not directly applicable to the Chichester plan area. It required some interpretation and in this regard advice had been taken from specialist consultants, and was considered in line with national guidance. Housing density would also be considered as appropriate, as an option which was open to the Council. Consultation would support reflection, would not necessarily result in resourcing issues, and would lead to an improved final document.

Mr Ayling further explained with reference to the Infrastructure planning and delivery, there was a mechanism in place for understanding specific infrastructure needs associated with each development, which involved appropriate consultations with all necessary agencies for example Southern Water, Highways England West Sussex County Council as the education authority. He added that it would be advantageous to bring forward a plan quickly, to support the coordination and understanding of the requirements. In the intervening time, it was vital to determine applications. There are a number of matters to consider over the coming months; most importantly the extent to which the Council has a housing supply, and the expectation was that there would be just under four years supply from 15 July onwards. This would change continuously as individual sites came forward, delivery rates altered with the impact of the wider economy and restrictions resulting from

Coronavirus, and new applications submitted. The gap between actual housing supply and the required five year housing supply was a significant matter, and it was within the Council's gift to revise the draft document as necessary.

Mr Ayling confirmed that the West Sussex Cycling Design Guide at paragraph 6.2 criteria 8 could be included in the document. With regards to ecosystem services, a policy approach adopted by the South Downs National Park Authority, focused on the standards of construction, and biodiversity net gain he suggested that whilst the draft document consultation process was on-going, these matters could be given further consideration by officers within the Chichester context.

Mr Ayling further confirmed that deleting Para 6.2 criteria 7 reference to DM34 Open Space, Sport and Recreation cited in the emerging Local Plan would be appropriate, to ensure developers understood the current status with regards to development management proposals. On the question of consultation, the document was non-statutory and as such the Council could take the process forward as it considered appropriate. Therefore it was suggested that it would be undertaken as an on-line focused consultation, with consultation arrangements utilising the current database of statutory consultees, individuals and organisations who have previously expressed an interest in planning policy and who will receive the standard letter to confirm the consultation was underway with hard copies provided on request. He added that it would be the decision of each Parish Council to conclude how it would disseminate information regarding the consultation. On the question referencing Southern Water, each application received would be assessed in accordance with advice obtained from each statutory body and the draft document would not alter that process.

Mr Whitty further commented that he did not believe there was an issue with the document existing in the public realm in regards to how developers would utilise it to question how they might submit applications and developers were always likely to query how any document may be interpreted. He explained that the benefit of the document would be in terms of consistency in dealing with applications and within the Council's policy framework would allow a focus on areas which were considered important. It would also have the advantage of defending sites which did not fit the criteria. Without this document, a Planning Inspector would review an application only in relation to the harm against the need. The document will have undergone a consultation process and allow officers to demonstrate to an Inspector how the Council were seeking to address issues in a sustainable manner.

Mr Ayling further explained that with regards to off-site infrastructure, the document was concerned with delivery in the short-term with relevant attributes, but there was also an awareness that applications would need to be determined if delivery of those attributes were not resolved. Therefore it was important that off-site infrastructure was included within the document. He also confirmed that in paragraph 4.6, the word 'will' would be altered to 'may'.

Mr Oakley proposed that in paragraph 6.2.4 the word 'will' should also be altered to 'may' which was seconded by Mr Barrett and Mr Potter. In a vote Members did not agree to alter the word as proposed.

In a vote the Planning Committee agreed to approve the revised recommendations:

- a) Approve the draft Interim Policy Statement (IPS) for Housing, as amended by the schedule of proposed amendments and any other changes as agreed at Committee, for development management purposes to be used to assess relevant planning applications with immediate effect; and
- b) Approve the publication of the draft IPS, as amended by the schedule of proposed amendments and any other changes as agreed at Committee, for a period of 4 weeks consultation.

Recommendation to **Approve** both recommendations.

87 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no part two items.

The meeting ended at 2.35 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

---

Date: