

**Minutes of a meeting of the  
Adur Planning Committee  
24 July 2017  
at 7.00**

Councillor Carol Albury (Chairman)  
Councillor Brian Coomber (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Les Alden	Councillor George Barton
**Councillor Robin Monk	Councillor Stephen Chipp
**Councillor Emily Hilditch	Councillor Geoff Patmore

\*\* Absent

**Officers:** Head of Planning and Development, Principal Planning Officer,  
Principal Planner, Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

---

**ADC-PC/013/17-18                      Substitute Members**

Councillor Paul Graysmark substituted for Councillor Robin Monk.

Councillor Brian Boggis substituted for Councillor Emily Hilditch.

**ADC-PC/014/17-18                      Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Geoff Patmore declared an interest in AWDM/0801/17, 25 Freshbrook Road, Lancing, but would consider the item with an open mind.

**ADC-PC/015/17-18                      Minutes**

**RESOLVED**, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26 June 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

**ADC-PC/016/17-18                      Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

**ADC-PC/017/17-18                      Planning Applications**

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

## **ADC-PC/018/17-18**

## **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.

## **ADC-PC/019/17-18**

## **Adur Infrastructure Contributions - Way Forward**

The Principal Planner presented the report to the Committee which was to consider the current system for obtaining infrastructure contributions in the Adur Local Plan area (Adur District, minus the South Downs National Park); the work which had been undertaken so far on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL); and options for the future.

The report recommended that no further work was undertaken on CIL, but that the current approach of using solely planning obligations was maintained until there was greater certainty as to whether the Government would proceed to an alternative to CIL as outlined in the Expert Panel Report accompanying the recent Housing White Paper.

The Principal Planner ran through the detail of the complex report to assist Members' consideration.

The Committee were advised the recommendation had been revised as follows:-

*The Planning Committee are recommended to consider the two options set out in the report and agree whether it recommends to the Executive Member for Regeneration that Option 2 should be taken forward i.e. not to progress with CIL.*

Members raised some queries of the Officer, which were answered in turn. The majority of Members were happy to agree the 'revised' recommendation as stated.

## **Decision**

The Committee **AGREED** to recommend to the Executive Member for Regeneration that Option 2 be taken forward, i.e. not to progress CIL, but to maintain the current s106 regime until an alternative to CIL is introduced by the Government.

In the meantime, to ensure that development in Adur helps to deliver infrastructure to support growth, the Council will continue to use s106s to support the effective delivery of infrastructure, and ensure it is in a position to respond to the introduction of LIT (or similar national regime) swiftly and effectively.

*Councillor George Barton left the meeting at 8.50 pm.*

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.55 pm it having commenced at 7.00 pm.

**Chairman**

Application Number: AWDM/1953/16	
Site:	<b>Grazing land south west of flyover, Steyning Road</b>
Proposal:	Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 52 no. dwellings (including the provision of 30% on-site affordable housing), internal roads and parking, informal open space and landscaping together with an enlarged vehicular access on the south-eastern side of the site onto Steyning Road (all matters reserved apart from the access). Proposed realignment of the Adur Tidal Wall flood defence scheme as an amendment to that approved under reference AWDM/1614/15. The application is accompanied by an Addendum to the original Environmental Statement.

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and advised Members of updates since publication of the agenda.

The Officer advised the report referred to an enlarged vehicle access, but would be a new vehicle access, and a revised Air Quality Assessment had recently been received however, Officers had had insufficient time to consider the document. He therefore suggested the final decision be delegated to Officers to allow more time to consider whether or not to remove reason 4 from the first recommendation.

The Committee were advised the application was a hybrid which sought outline planning permission for housing and a full application for the proposed realignment of the Adur Tidal Wall flood defence scheme.

Members were shown an aerial photograph of the site, together with further photographs of the area and various plans for the proposal. The Officer stressed to the Committee the application was in outline and should not be determined on the basis of specifically 52 dwellings of any particular design, appearance or layout as all submitted information was illustrative only, with the exception of the means of access.

The Officer stated that following the Inspector's modifications to the Local Plan the site was proposed to be excluded from the Shoreham-Lancing Local Green Gap but remained within the countryside.

At present, It was felt there was no essential need for development on the proposed site and the greenfield site was not appropriate for development. Strong objections had been received from the National Park Authority as well as from Historic England and the West Sussex Landscape Architect.

The Members were advised Officers felt the development would harm the riverside setting and the setting of the Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings within it. The realignment of the Tidal Wall would also not leave sufficient space for any landscape buffer between the Park and the development itself.

The Officer however, did advise there were no West Sussex Highway objections on traffic impact grounds, and no objections in flood risk terms due to flood defences being put in place, but the site itself did not meet Sequential or Exception Tests in terms of the best place for residential development.

Members were advised further information had been requested by the Environmental Health Officer relating to the impact of noise and Highways were requesting a further Road Safety Audit.

The Officer reminded Members both recommendations were for refusal.

Members raised a number of queries with the Officers, which were answered in turn.

There were further representations from:-

Objectors:                Mr Eric Cleobury  
                                 Ms Catherine Arnold

Supporter:                Mr Robert Thornton

The Committee considered the application at length and agreed a comprehensive report however, the majority of Members felt the application should be deferred until Officers could consider outstanding information.

## **Decision**

That the application be **DEFERRED** to await the Local Plan Inspector's full report and to consider other outstanding information.

Application Number: AWDM/0721/17	
Site:	<b>New Sussex Hotel</b>
Proposal:	Extension and re-configure new accommodation to rear of existing hotel to include a new function room, conference room and new enlarged kitchen with 11 new hotel rooms over first and second floors. No hotel parking is accommodated on site. Proposed on site 3-bedroom family home for the applicants to the west (rear) of the hotel with parking provision for two cars (amended re-submission of AWDM/1804/16).

The Principal Planning Officer began his presentation of the report by showing Members an aerial view of the site, and ran through details of the application, which included various plans.

The application related to a 3 storey hotel at the south end of South Street, close to the roundabout junction with Brighton Road. The proposal was to increase the accommodation and facilities at the hotel.

The Officer advised there would be two car spaces for the new dwelling but none stipulated for the hotel. The Highway Officer had no significant concerns regarding parking as the site was situated in a sustainable location, being close to several public car parks, bus routes and the train station.

Members were notified of an objection received from 178 South Street, which was to the north of the property, and was recently being converted into flats. Their prime concern was regarding the proposed outbuilding and its impact on their light and outlook. However, the Officer demonstrated to Members the unlikely adverse impact on the occupiers of the flat.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

There were further representations from:

Objector: Mr Patrick Lott

Supporter: Mr Paul Burgess

The majority of the Committee felt the proposal would be beneficial to the area and improve the southern end of South Street, Lancing.

### **Decision**

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

1. Approved Plans

2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Lighting details to be submitted and agreed
4. Extraction details to be submitted and agreed
5. Surface water disposal details
6. Full contaminated land
7. No part of the development shall be first occupied until the car parking has been constructed in accordance with the approved site plan. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated purpose
8. Hours of use of studio to be limited to between 8am and 8pm daily
9. Materials to be agreed including details of window screens
10. Dwelling to be occupied by hotel manager and dependent relatives only
11. Use of function room to cease at 11.30pm and external doors closed at 10pm.
12. Construction Management Plan
13. Noise management plan

Application Number: AWDM/0801/17	
Site:	<b>25 Freshbrook Road</b>
Proposal:	First floor side and rear extension to north and east elevations (re-submission of AWDM/0319/17).

The Head of Planning and Development advised Members that planning permission was refused in May however, after some discussion with the Planning Services Manager, the application had been re-submitted and had been called-in for Members' consideration.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting Members had been handed a number of photographs produced by the applicant to assist in their consideration of the application.

The Officer ran through the detail of the application and Members were shown an aerial view of the site, block plan, existing and proposed elevations and a number of photographs.

There had been no objections received from neighbouring residents, or from Lancing Parish Council. The Officer's concerns were in relation to design, its relationship with the existing property and adjoining bungalows, hence the recommendation for refusal.

The Officer concluded by advising Members he felt it was an on balance recommendation given the scale of development around and the set back of the extension from the road.

There were further representations from:

Supporters:               Mrs Claire Downie  
                                  Mr Liam Price

Following the representations, the Members unanimously overturned the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application and agreed to approve.

### **Decision**

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

1.     Approved plans
2.     Standard 3 year time limit
3.     External materials to match
4.     Ancillary use to the main dwelling only