

Minutes of a meeting of the  
Adur Planning Committee  
8 June 2020  
at 7.00 pm

Councillor Carol Albury (Chair)

Councillor David Balfe  
Councillor Kevin Boram  
Councillor Stephen Chipp  
Councillor Lee Cowen

Councillor Joss Loader  
Councillor Andy McGregor  
Councillor Paul Mansfield

**ADC-PC/1/19-20      Substitute Members**

Councillor Andy McGregor substituted for Councillor Brian Coomber.  
Councillor Kevin Boram substituted for Councillor Pat Beresford.

**ADC-PC/2/19-20      Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**ADC-PC/3/19-20      Public Question Time**

The Chairman advised that there were no pre-submitted questions from members of the public about any matter for which the Council had a responsibility or which affected the District.

The Council's procedure rules require advance notification of all public questions where a committee meeting is being held remotely.

**ADC-PC/4/19-20      Confirmation of Minutes**

**RESOLVED**, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 May 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

A recorded vote was taken as follows:

For: Councillors Albury, Balfe, Boram, Chipp, Cowen, Loader, Mansfield and McGregor

**ADC-PC/5/19-20      Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

Application Number: AWDM/0204/20	
Site:	<b>Kingston Wharf, Brighton Road, Shoreham-by-Sea</b>
Proposal:	Mixed-use redevelopment comprised three blocks of residential dwellings (4 to 8 storeys) and mixed-use business centre (office, storage and cafe uses) - incorporating riverside walk, landscaping and ancillary car and cycle parking.

The Head of Planning and Development began by outlining the scheme, which included a number of plans and photographs to assist, and advised the Principal Planning Officer (Major Developments) would follow his presentation to provide an update on the scheme and changes made to a number of the planning conditions.

The Officer indicated on an aerial photograph the position of the site for development which was part of the Western Harbour Arm, the site allocated in the Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP), an extensive location for development in the 2017 Local Plan. The JAAP was now the adopted planning framework providing detailed guidance for developments coming forward in the Western Harbour Arm.

The Officer advised the application was for 255 residential dwellings, with a semi-basement parking level and a mixed use commercial ‘enterprise’ centre on the western part of the site. Each of the residential apartment blocks had access to raised residential gardens, communal areas, to include some play provision, and the scheme included a riverside walk for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Officer referred to the design of the buildings and stated that extensive negotiation had taken place with the Coastal Design Panel for scrutiny by independent architects and urban designers, and various changes had been made to respond to comments in order to provide greater articulation to the block.

Members were shown a number of photo montages to assist in their consideration of the application which conveyed the scheme’s relationship with the street scene.

The Officer referred to the various sustainability measures undertaken by the applicants, which included the use of flat roofs to accommodate solar panels, and Members were advised the applicant had been keen to encourage a highly sustainable development.

Members were advised the applicant was determined to achieve a 100% affordable housing scheme however, the strategic partnership with Homes England had meant the application promoted just 30% but the applicants had submitted a memorandum of understanding to pursue additional grant funding post planning to secure and build out a 100% affordable housing scheme. The Officer referred Members to page 20 of the report, Table 1 Housing Mix by Tenure and advised that the rent levels would be social

rather than affordable levels which would make a considerable difference to meeting the future affordable needs of the district.

Moving on from the residential part of the scheme, the Officer referred to the commercial development which included for storage, offices and an element of flexible floor space for either office or storage. The applicants had agreed, through the legal agreement, their commitment to market the flexible space as offices.

The Officer outlined the appearance and design of the commercial development and Members were shown the amended plans. The key change had been to the western elevation which incorporated increased brickwork and a checkerboard effect. Any advertisement on the building would be dealt with by a separate application. Landscaping would be provided along the site frontage but has been compromised to create space for the cyclepath.

The Officer referred to recent discussion on the likelihood of incorporating some pontoons along the frontage of the site. Further discussions were being held with the applicants and the Shoreham Port Authority to see if the Port Authority could support the idea of some similar improved access along the water frontage.

In conclusion, the Head of Planning and Development outlined the content of the addendum circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) updated the Committee on the additional conditions to the report and other amendments:-

*Condition 7 which referred to Means of Enclosure - proposed to be extended to include balconies.*

*Condition 8 which referred to B1 business use - proposed to be extended to have further information about the management of these uses, sizes of spaces and facilities available to them and the way in which businesses would be supported.*

*Another potential condition following further discussion with highways regarding interim arrangements at the access crossing points where the cyclepath will eventually cross them.*

*Condition 25 which referred to communal heating and plant - the Environment Agency had asked for a condition to protect any basement plant against flooding.*

*Condition 27 which referred to energy efficiency - that air quality emissions from any energy generating plant be subject to low nitrogen dioxide emissions, and verification of levels of renewable energy be added.*

*Condition 31 which referred to lighting - in accordance with the request of the Port Authority, to add a requirement for verification of the light design once approved and installed*

*With regard to the legal agreement, the Environmental Health Officer had recommended an air quality mitigation contribution of just over £88,000. There are ongoing discussions as to whether this amount should be reduced to take into account on site emissions measures and EV charge points.*

*On page 20 the applicants had re-confirmed that 95% of buildings would meet the Building Regulations Standards M4(2) for Accessible and Adaptable dwellings. Wheelchair housing M4 (3) could be covered under the legal agreement.*

*On a point of information, the setback of the building from the site frontage compared with the existing building setback would be between one and a half and three metres in from the edge of the site in order to achieve the widened pavement and the future segregated cycle path.*

*Consultation responses - no response from Southern Water but can be covered under the delegation period. Discussions are to continue with the CCG regarding whether there is need for or contribution for any health facility arising from the development. Regarding the table on page 52 of the report, Officers still await the Environmental Health Officer's comments on the hours proposed. In consideration of further recent highway information the Highway Authority had stated an initial impression that Junction modelling was now acceptable.*

Members raised queries on the presentation for clarification which were answered by the Officers to the Members' satisfaction and included, in summary:-

- the aesthetics of the residential blocks/commercial centre and their relationship with the character of the street scene;
- the capacity of junctions for developments and charging points for electric bikes;
- the use of the semi-basement car park and how delivery vehicles access the site;
- Car Share Scheme;
- affordable housing - memorandum of undertaking; and
- the safety of riverside railings.

*The meeting was adjourned at 8.30 pm, and reconvened at 8.35 pm.*

There were six further representations from registered speakers, three in objection and three in support, and all had elected to join the meeting.

Members supported the provision of much needed affordable homes and felt they would provide strong social benefit and make a significant contribution. However, it was felt by some Members that there were still a number of outstanding matters, within the report, which required further consideration and felt the proposal had not demonstrated high quality design that justified the height of the development proposed at one of the District's key gateway sites.

The Head of Planning and Development advised Members the application had been four years in the making and considerable work had been carried out by the applicants before it had been brought to Committee. He said the late inclusion of the JAAP proposals for the cycle path had caused significant delays, and with regard to design an extensive design process had taken place, and the form of the proposed buildings had followed the JAAP layout proposals. However, he felt the applicants would be willing to further discuss materials, finishes and design details.

The Committee Members largely supported the scheme however, they unanimously agreed to defer the application for Officers to discuss the design and form of the buildings with the applicants before coming back to Committee for further consideration.

A vote was taken by roll call. A proposal was put forward by Councillor Stephen Chipp to defer the application, and seconded by Councillor Joss Loader and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Albury, Balfe, Boram, Chipp, Cowen, Loader, Mansfield and McGregor

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

### **Decision**

The Committee Members unanimously agreed to **DEFER** the application for Officers to discuss the design and form of the buildings with the applicants before coming back to the Planning Committee for further consideration.

---

The meeting ended at 9.34 pm