

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Adur Planning Committee
18 April 2017
at 7.00**

Councillor Peter Metcalfe (Chairman)
Councillor Carol Albury (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Les Alden	Councillor George Barton
Councillor Ken Bishop	**Councillor Stephen Chipp
**Councillor Brian Coomber	Councillor Geoff Patmore

** Absent

Officers: Head of Planning and Development, Solicitor and Democratic Services Officer

ADC-PC/067/16-17

Substitute Members

Councillor Brian Boggis substituted for Councillor Stephen Chipp.
Councillor David Simmons substituted for Councillor Brian Coomber.

ADC-PC/068/16-17

Declarations of Interest

Cllr Brian Boggis declared an interest in Item 5.1, AWDM/1770/17, Miller and Carter, as he lives within 50 yards of the public house/restaurant and elected to abstain from voting on the item.

Cllr Carol Albury declared an interest in Item 5.1, AWDM/1770/17, Miller and Carter, as she lives close to the public house/restaurant however, elected to take part in consideration of the item and approach same with an open mind.

Councillor David Simmons declared an interest in Item 5.4, AWDM/1391/16, 10 Old Rectory Gardens, as had visited the site at the request of the owner prior to being asked to sit on the Committee. Cllr Simmons advised he would approach consideration of the application with an open mind.

ADC-PC/069/16-17

Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 13 March 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

ADC-PC/070/16-17

Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

ADC-PC/071/16-17

Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

ADC-PC/072/16-17

Public Question Time

The Chairman invited members of the public to ask questions or make statements about any matter for which the Council had a responsibility or which affected the District.

There were no public questions.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.50 pm it having commenced at 7.00 pm.

Chairman

Application Number: AWDM/1770/16	
Site:	Miller and Carter 43 Manor Road Lancing
Proposal:	Retention of a bull statue, garden jumbrella, cold store, lighting to existing fence, glass balustrading to front access ramp and associated landscaping.

The Head of Planning and Development advised Members that the description of the proposal on the agenda should be amended to read 'Retention of' and not 'Proposed construction' as the application was now retrospective.

The Officer began his presentation by showing the Committee an aerial photograph of the site, a number of photographs to clarify the number of alterations to be approved, together with various plans.

The Officer stated there had been some concerns raised regarding noise emission from the cold store equipment however, the applicant had recently provided a noise assessment report which had been considered by Environmental Health Officers. The Officers were of the opinion that the noise levels should not have a negative impact on residential amenity and therefore had no further concerns or issues to raise in relation to the cold store part of the application.

The Committee were advised that Officers did not feel that the alterations proposed materially affected the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore the recommendation was for approval.

The Head of Planning and Development advised that some residents had raised concerns about other lighting, particularly on the building, which had caused nuisance. In the interest of neighbourliness he was prepared to write a letter to the applicant expressing concern that works had proceeded without planning permission and to encourage the Public House to make adaptations to their existing lighting which had caused nuisance to nearby residents.

There was a further representation from an objector, Ms Pauline Burton.

Members raised a number of queries, which the Officer answered in turn.

The Committee considered the application and expressed concern the application was retrospective; were unsure from the report when lighting would be switched off, and therefore felt more information was needed before they could make their decision.

Decision

That the application be **DEFERRED** for additional information relating to lighting and opening hours for the Public House/Restaurant.

Application Number: AWDM/0246/17	
Site:	Land West of 183 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea
Proposal:	Demolition of existing double garage and erection of two-storey two-bedroom detached house with solar array on roof.

The Head of Planning & Development began by showing Members a bird's eye view of the site, various photographs and referred to the relevant planning history for the site. The application was an amended submission following refusal by the Planning Committee on 6 February 2017 for a three bedroomed house on the same site.

The Officer referred Members to the proposed plans, and outlined the proposal which was to demolish the garage and construct a two-storey, 2-bedroom contemporary dwelling, smaller than the previous proposal (internal floor area of 87 sqm compared with 104 sqm previously).

The Officer advised that the applicant had submitted a detailed Design and Access Statement which set out the justification for the proposed development and ran through a number of the issues raised in terms of the plot size, design of the dwelling and the relationship to neighbouring properties.

Officers believed the proposal addressed Members' previous concerns, would fit comfortably in the street scene, and therefore the recommendation was for approval.

There were further representations from:

Ward Councillor: Cllr Joss Loader

Supporter: Mr Howard Carter (architect)

The Committee discussed the application at length, and raised a number of queries with the Officer, which were answered in turn.

Some Members still believed the proposal would have an adverse effect on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and on the character and appearance of the street scene, despite the Officer's belief the latest proposal had addressed the Committee's previous concerns.

Decision

That the application be **DEFERRED**, to seek further amendments.

Application Number: AWDM/0259/17	
Site:	52 Ring Road, Lancing
Proposal:	Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of single-storey rear and side extension and roof alterations to facilitate 2nd floor accommodation comprising rear dormer with Juliet balcony, hip to gable front roofslope with balcony, hip to gable to side roof slopes, front porch and entrance steps.

The Head of Planning and Development began his presentation by showing Members an aerial view of the site and various photographs of the existing property in the street scene.

The Officer briefly outlined the proposal for the Committee, and advised a number of representations had been received objecting to the contemporary style in relation to the character of the adjoining properties.

Officers had assessed the proposal in design terms and did not feel any harm would be caused to the character or appearance of the street scene, given the traditional use of render and slate, and no unacceptable level of overlooking from the rear balcony that would justify refusal.

There were further representations from:

Objectors: Ms Helen Wells & Mr Geoff Hobbs
 Supporter: Mr Pete Flavell (applicant)

The Committee discussed the application, with some Members raising concern as to lack of adequate parking, the proposal of a slate roof as opposed to a plain red tiled roof and the inclusion of a Juliet balcony at the rear of the property.

After some consideration, the majority of Members agreed the Officer's recommendation to approve however, with the inclusion of two additional conditions, i.e. an additional parking space and replacement of the Juliet balcony with an obscure glazed window.

Decision

That the application be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. External materials as specified
4. Additional parking space provided
5. Replacement of the rear Juliet balcony with an obscure glazed window

Application Number: AWDM/1391/16	
Site:	10 Old Rectory Gardens, Southwick
Proposal:	Retrospective application for brick boundary wall to the front boundary part abutting Old Rectory Gardens and part abutting Kingson Lane (amendment to AWDM/0575/12)

The Head of Planning and Development showed Members an aerial photograph of the site, various photographs, and briefly outlined the retrospective application.

The Officer referred the Committee to the planning history within the report which indicated a wall of similar proportions had previously been permitted but should have had flint panels to avoid damaging the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Buildings.

Officers felt the flint was an important aspect of the original proposal for a wall and recommended refusal.

There was a further representation from Mr Gregg Wedekind, the applicant.

Members briefly discussed the application and concluded that although preferable to have flint panels within the wall, the property adjoined the Conservation Area, but was not part of it and therefore agreed to grant permission for the retention of the wall.

Decision

That planning permission be **GRANTED** for retention of the wall.

Application Number: AWDM/1662/16	
Site:	10 Old Rectory Gardens, Southwick
Proposal:	Detached double garage at front.

Members were shown an aerial view of the site, photographs, block and site plans and elevations.

Planning permission was sought for a detached brick-built double garage on the front of the site. The proposed garage would be sited only 1.8m from the boundary of the neighbouring property and forward to the house, close to the front boundary wall.

The main issue of concern for Officers was the forward projection of the double garage; whether the size and projection was appropriate; and its impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.

The Officer's recommendation was for refusal.

There was a further representation from Mr Gregg Wedekind, the applicant.

Members considered the application and felt that since no representations had been received in objection to the proposal, and the proposed garage was not within the Conservation Area, they were happy to grant permission.

Decision

That planning permission be **APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit.
2. External materials.
3. Approved plans.

