



ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL

30 August 2024

Adur Planning Committee	
Date:	2 September 2024
Time:	6.30 pm
Venue:	QEII Room, Shoreham Centre, Shoreham-by-Sea

Committee Membership: Councillors Carol Albury, Dan Flower (Chair), Caroline Fuhrmann, Andrew Harvey (Vice-Chair), Pauline Higgins, Nigel Jenner, Gerry Thompson, Julia Watts and Andy McGregor

NOTE:

Anyone wishing to speak at this meeting on a planning application before the Committee should register by telephone (01903 221006) or e-mail democratic.services@adur-worthing.gov.uk before **midday on Friday 30 August 2024**.

Agenda

Part A

7. **Planning Applications** (Pages 3 - 8)

To consider the reports by the Assistant Director for Regenerative Development, attached as Item 7.

Recording of this meeting

Please note that this meeting is being audio live streamed and a recording of the meeting will be available the Council's website. This meeting will be available on our website for one year and will be deleted after that period. The Council will not be recording any discussions in Part B of the agenda (where the press and public have been excluded).

For Democratic Services enquiries relating to this meeting please contact:	For Legal Services enquiries relating to this meeting please contact:
Katy McMullan Democratic Services Officer 01903 221006 katy.mcmullan@adur-worthing.gov.uk	Caroline Perry Senior Lawyer & Deputy Monitoring Officer 01903 221081 Caroline.perry@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Duration of the Meeting: Three hours after the commencement of the meeting the Chairperson will adjourn the meeting to consider if it wishes to continue. A vote will be taken and a simple majority in favour will be necessary for the meeting to continue.

ADDENDUM REPORT

Item 5

Application Number:	AWDM/0873/24	Recommendation - APPROVE, subject to consultation response from County LLFA.
Site:	Land East Of 1 To 11 Mercury House Ham Road	
Proposal:	<p>Application to Vary Condition 27 of previously approved AWDM/1024/23 and AWDM/1450/21.</p> <p>Amendment comprising: Alternative landscape design, including use of containers for planting along site frontages (in order to accomodate underground drainage attenuation tanks), also provision of electricity substation within central courtyard, with associated changes to landscaping.</p> <p>Original description (as previously amended by AWDM/1024/23) : erection of two blocks of development ranging in height between 3 - 9 storeys comprising 159 residential units comprising a mix of 1-bed, 2- bed and 3-bed units (including a minimum of 30% of affordable housing), commercial (class e) floorspace at ground floor, and associated parking and landscaping. Application to vary conditions 1 of previously approved AWDM/1450/21</p>	
Applicant:	The Hyde Group	Ward: St. Mary's
Agent:	HGP Architects	
Case Officer:	Stephen Cantwell	

Amended Plans and Additional Supporting Information

An amended plan has been received 30-08-24. This is appended on the following page, alongside the original approved plan. The applicant's comments are as follows:

The amendments to the courtyard layout & landscaping are in response to the officer's report and comments of Adur Residents Environmental Action (AREA). They incorporate several changes as follows to recover and enhance the amount of green amenity space provided and its visual and recreational amenity value:

- Planted grasscrete-type surface to the substation access area without compromising the ability for parking during servicing visits,

- More extensive use of wildflower planting, which is intended to aid biodiversity value.
- A additional tree alongside to assist in screening the substation, including views from the entrance archway,
- Re-introduction of bench seating to contribute to amenity value of the space, and its social recreational use.

Additional Consultation Responses

Tree officer: I consider the size, type and species of trees to be acceptable, and I am happy with the proposed maintenance. The containers are to be aluminium with wooden sleeper surrounds, and have water reservoirs built in, as containers are to be used. I consider that these will be suitable as the wooded element is for aesthetics and not structural.

Highway Authority: As this reverts to providing trees without planters [in Brighton Road], no concern is raised.

Environmental Health: No objection

County Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA): Awaited

Planning Assessment Update

Following further discussion with the applicants, it is evident that provision of a substation at the height required for it's safe operation above floodwater level, is significantly greater than the ground floor height of the building. This mis-match precludes installation within either of the apartment buildings

Given the necessity of the free-standing substation building, the latest amendments of 30-08-2024 listed above and shown in the amended plan below are considered to strike an improved balance between this operational necessity and the quality of the space for the enjoyment of future residents. The reinstated and accentuated landscape planting together with the re-introduction of benches is now considered to provide a suitable and well landscaped outcome.

Three of the consultees have confirmed that they are satisfied with the amended plans to the Brighton Road tree planting and future maintenance, which includes irrigation watering for container trees in the courtyard and Eastern Avenue frontage. As such, only the response of the County Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), concerning the relationship of the trees to the drainage mains in Broughton Road remains to be received (this is due by 10th September). The recommendation below is therefore slightly amended to reflect this

Revised Recommendation: APPROVE, subject to consultation response from the County LLFA.

Appendix: Amended Plan 30-08-2024, and Previously Approved Plan



Proposed Courtyard Layout

Key:

- 1. Shade tolerant wildflower turf
- 2. Grasscrete type stabilisation paver covered with shade tolerant wildflower turf
- 3. Trees in planters
- 4. Benches for external seating
- 5. Single species planting groups
- 6. Mixed planting areas



Approved Courtyard Layout

Item 6

Application Number:	AWDM/0785/24	Recommendation - REFUSE
Site:	Land East Of 1 To 11 Mercury House, Ham Road Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex	
Proposal:	<p>Application to vary condition 1, of previously approved AWDM/1450/21 (as amended by AWDM/1024/23) to incorporate amendment of roof design for the 8-9 storey tower section of block b to replace approved pitched roof with a flat roof.</p> <p>Original description (as previously amended by AWDM/1024/23) : erection of two blocks of development ranging in height between 3 - 9 storeys comprising 159 residential units comprising a mix of 1-bed, 2- bed and 3-bed units (including a minimum of 30% of affordable housing), commercial (class e) floorspace at ground floor, and associated parking and landscaping. Application to vary conditions 1 of previously approved AWDM/1450/21 (approved drawings).</p>	
Applicant:	The Hyde Group	Ward: St. Mary's
Agent:	HGP Architects	
Case Officer: Stephen Cantwell		

Additional Supporting Information

The applicant has provided the additional further comment (slightly summarised):

‘As you are aware, one of our key focuses for delivering this project is a sustainable development that achieves an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating of A. This offers a significant saving for the running costs for the much needed affordable housing in this area.

In regards to the concerns about the flat roof, such as allowing sufficient space to fit the solar panels on the flat roof, we had to run a full model to enable us to calculate the EPC rating A. We can confirm the flat roof is the optimum design for installing PV, if we are to achieve this saving for the future residents.

The development contractor (PMC Ltd.) is extremely experienced in doing flat roofs with PV panels on it and we have completed over 30 projects with a flat roof with PV arrangement, including 10 large blocks and a further 3 currently at Kingston Wharf. We are extremely well versed and experienced in all of the potential issues with PV on a flat roof and have not had any issues with any of the blocks we have built previously.

Due to the shading caused by the pitch of the approved roof, we need considerably more panels to achieve the same level of output, because any panel on the Northern elevation is calculated to work at a much lower efficiency. The current PV design for the pitched roof is 90 panels to allow us to achieve building regulation compliance.

The amount of space required on a pitched roof to allow for a man-safe system means the panels become spread apart, in a similar way as they do on a flat roof. This has an adverse impact on the amount of panels we can fit on the pitched roof.

This is not a normal PV installation whereas panels can be grouped together due the fact we are allocating on average 3 panels per property with each flat having a standalone inverter. The PV panels are directly connected to each flat, so the occupier gets the full benefit of the panels connected to their flat. However to achieve this, direct access routes are required for cables from the roof to the apartment in order to balance the system in an orderly way.

The importance of safe access for future maintenance without the need for expensive plant and scaffold that imposes a larger service charge for the tenants should not be underestimated. When PV is installed on flat roofs there is no ongoing cost for access as PV panels require a regime of regular cleaning. Hence, in a pitched roof situation this becomes an onerous maintenance factor.

When constructing a flat roof parapets walls are installed to 1100mm high along with roof access providing a safe working environment for the operatives maintaining the PV.

With a pitched roof they also have to clear out the valley gutters regularly, which again requires expensive access equipment. We try and create spaces for people that are both cost effective to live in and sustainable notwithstanding the driver to secure EPC A

We would also reiterate that all of the buildings surrounding the Adur Civic Centre have flat roofs, including the building directly opposite, so the proposed flat roof is more in keeping with the surrounding buildings.'

Additional Consultation Responses. None

Planning Assessment Update

The applicant's additional comment throws further light on the practical issues and cost of providing and maintaining solar PV panels, and more generally the maintenance of gutters.

Whilst this does not affect the report conclusions concerning energy and CO₂, (the attainment of policy compliant levels appears to be reached without the proposed change), the practical benefits of achieving greater renewable energy levels, an EPC

'A' standard and overall affordability to residents and in terms of building maintenance, remain as material considerations.

It is regrettable that no other architectural solution has come forward which might consider something other than truncation of the towers. The importance of design in this highly prominent gateway location, as considered in the officer report, is considered to remain of greater overall importance and accordingly the recommendation of refusal remains.

Recommendation: Refuse