

# Public Document Pack

Minutes of a meeting of the  
Adur Planning Committee  
8 February 2021  
at 7.00 pm

Councillor Carol Albury (Chair)  
Councillor Stephen Chipp (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor David Balfe  
Councillor Kevin Boram  
Councillor Brian Coomber

Councillor Lee Cowen  
Councillor Joss Loader  
Councillor Paul Mansfield

## **ADC-PC/49/19-20      Substitute Members**

There were no substitute Members.

## **ADC-PC/50/19-20      Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Joss Loader declared an interest on item 6.1 AWDM/1085/20, 66 Old Fort Road, as one of the registered speakers was making a representation on behalf of Shoreham Beach Residents' Association. Councillor Joss Loader advised she had not taken part in any discussions on the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Paul Mansfield declared an interest on item 6.1 AWDM/1085/20, 66 Old Fort Road, as he was good friends with the applicant's father but did not know the applicant. The Councillor also declared an interest in item 7 Sompting Parish Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Consultation - Response from Adur District Council as a Parish Councillor. He stated he had not been involved with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

## **ADC-PC/51/19-20      Public Question Time**

There were no questions raised under Public Question Time.

## **ADC-PC/52/19-20      Confirmation of Minutes**

**RESOLVED**, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 January 2021 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

A recorded vote was taken by the Democratic Services Officer which was as follows:  
For: Councillors Carol Albury, Stephen Chipp, David Balfe, Kevin Boram, Brian Coomber, Lee Cowen, Joss Loader and Paul Mansfield.

## **ADC-PC/53/19-20      Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

## **ADC-PC/54/19-20      Planning Applications**

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

### **Planning Applications (Appendix)**

## **ADC-PC/55/19-20      Sompting Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report which related to the Adur District Council response to the Sompting Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The Officer advised the Parish had been working on the Plan for some time and a version had been taken to examination in 2018. However, that version had been removed by the Parish themselves and since that time they had been working on a revised version.

The Officer advised it was the first consultation on the revised document, which included development related to rural businesses and a community farm within the Local Green Gap. The Plan also incorporated a Housing Estates and Design Guide.

The Officer referred Members to Appendix 1, which were comments that Adur Officers had made on the consultation draft, and it was hoped the Parish Councillors would find these useful when further developing their Plan.

In conclusion, the Officer advised Members of an amendment to the recommendation within the report under 6.1 2). to state:-

*Any comments from the Committee are collated and forwarded to the **Leader of the Council** for consultation, and then submitted as ADC's formal response to the Draft Sompting Parish Neighbourhood Plan.*

The Officer advised it had been agreed that as the Executive Member for Regeneration sat on the Sompting Parish Council it would be preferable for the Leader of the Council to collate and forward comments for consultation.

The Planning Policy Manager invited Members to put forward any questions or comments.

A Member referred to Appendix 1, page 63, Policy 9, where Dankton Lane was mentioned as a potential site for health and wellbeing uses, and Officers had asked the Parish to define health and wellbeing uses. The Member queried how specific they needed to be and the Officer responded by advising that the Parish needed to define their terms, e.g. whether considering outdoor gym equipment or the potential for a building to be used as a gym.

Another Member questioned whether the Neighbourhood Plan had to be submitted to the Inspector/Secretary of State. The Officer advised there was a statutory process set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Act. In summary, once the Parish had made revisions, there would be further consultations, which the District Council would lead on, and then it would go to examination. Should the Plan get through, there would be a referendum and if this were successful, their Plan would become part of the Development Plan.

The Member thanked the Adur Officers for advising Sompting Parish Council how to put together a clear and detailed Neighbourhood Plan.

## **Decision**

The Planning Committee considered the proposed consultation response set out in Appendix 1 and agreed comments would be collated and forwarded to the Leader of the Council for consultation, and then submitted as ADC's formal response to the Draft Sompting Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

### **ADC-PC/56/19-20      ADC Good Practice Guide for Houseboats**

The Planning Policy Manager introduced the report and reminded Members a guide had been produced back in 2007 and that the one before them now was an updated version of the document to reflect changes in planning policy, and the creation of the Adur Tidal Walls and the Marine Management Organisation. Consultation had taken place with various bodies, including residents of the Houseboats.

The Officer advised a revised version of the Guide (January 2021) had been circulated prior to the meeting.

The Planning Policy Manager invited Members to put forward any queries or comments.

A Member referred to 3.2 of the guide which stated that planning permission would be required for fences over 2 metres and said he felt that was high for a fence and could block views of the estuary. He then referred to 7.3 of the guide which stated fences should be kept low, up to 1 metre, and therefore sought clarification.

The Planning Services Manager advised that the normal rules for fences, that were not adjacent to a road or public footpath, were that they could be built up to 2 metres without planning permission, potentially blocking views. However, the Officer agreed it was tall in that particular area, hence, Officers had stated it was preferred that fences were only erected if necessary, and kept to 1 metre. He said that unfortunately, in certain locations, if they were between 1 and 2 metres in height they would not require planning permission but felt the guide was correct in stating the Council's preference.

The Member raised a further query regarding the discharge of sewage and that the guide stated it was preferable that discharge of untreated sewage and other wastes to the estuary were avoided however, he felt it should be ceased altogether. The Officer referred the Member to 11.2 of the guide which stated that at present there was not a financially viable solution to the issue. Members were concerned at this situation and asked that this, and their concerns regarding tall fences be forwarded to the Executive Member for Regeneration.

Members thanked Officers for the time spent on reviewing the guide.

## **Decision**

The Planning Committee noted the contents of the document and any comments would be forwarded to the Executive Member for Regeneration.

The chairman closed the meeting at 10.05 pm it having commenced at 7.05 pm

Application Number: AWDM/1085/20	
Site:	<b>66 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea</b>
Proposal:	Demolition of a two storey house and replacement with a three storey 5 bedroom detached house.

The Planning Services Manager introduced the report and advised there was nothing further to add since publication.

The Officer began his presentation by showing Members an aerial photograph of the site; highlighted its relationship with neighbouring properties; and clarified the extent of the application site. He referred to the dispute over the ownership of part of the and advised Members it was not a planning matter.

The Committee Members were shown a number of plans and photographs to assist in their consideration of the proposal.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

Members raised queries with the Officer for clarification and in summary, these included:-

- the permitted gap to the boundary;
- the potential impact on neighbouring properties due to loss of light and outlook;
- the lack of demarcation at the rear of the proposal/public safety concerns; and
- no reference made in the Construction Management Plan for the applicant to undertake work on the nature reserve.

*Councillor Stephen Chipp advised the Chair that he lost internet connection during the presentation and elected to abstain from voting on the matter.*

There were further representations from 3 objectors and 1 supporter who had all elected to join the meeting.

During debate, it was apparent that the majority of the Members were opposed to the application due to its scale and overbearing nature.

A proposal was put forward by Councillor David Balfe to refuse the application, against the Officer's recommendation, and seconded by Councillor Kevin Boram, due to the scale and massing of the proposed dwelling being out of character with the surrounding area.

A vote was taken by roll call and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Albury, Balfe, Boram, Coomber, Cowen and Loader

Against: 0

Abstentions: Councillors Chipp and Mansfield

## **Decision**

The Planning Committee overturned the Officer's recommendation to approve, and **REFUSED** the application on the grounds that the scale and massing of the proposed dwelling was out of character with the surrounding area.

Application Number: AWDM/1983/20	
Site:	<b>22 Mill Hill, Shoreham-by-Sea</b>
Proposal:	Roof extension including raising of ridge and eaves height, enlarged barn ends and ground floor infill extension to north and south elevations. (Amended resubmission of AWDM/0812/20).

The Planning Services Manager introduced the report and advised there was nothing further to add since the report was published.

Members were shown aerial photographs of the site and the Officer indicated the two properties that would be most affected by the development.

In conclusion, the Officer presented a variety of existing and proposed plans, together with a number of photographs to assist Members in their consideration of the application.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

There were no questions raised on the presentation by Members.

There were further representations from two objectors who had elected to join the meeting.

A vote was taken by roll call and the vote was as follows:

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

Against: 0

Abstentions: Councillor Coomber

### **Decision**

The Planning Committee agreed to **APPROVE** the application, subject to an additional condition withdrawing permitted development rights for future extensions and outbuildings, and the following conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. External materials to match existing
4. No windows or openings other than those approved shall be inserted into the north or south roof slope or side walls of the building.
5. The roof lights on the north and south roof slope and the north side roof slope of the rear projection shall be obscure glazed at all times and non opening unless 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

6. The south side window of the rear extension shall be obscure glazed and non opening unless 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

#### Informative

1. Proactive with amendments



Application Number: AWDM/1761/20	
Site:	<b>18 Southdown Road, Shoreham-by-Sea</b>
Proposal:	Proposed garden room.

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and, whilst sharing aerial views of the site, advised the proposal was within the Conservation Area.

The proposal was to demolish the garage and, on the same footprint, erect a garden room to be used ancillary to the main dwelling.

The Officer referred Members to the long list of objections within the report but advised the majority were prior to the amended plans being received. He agreed there had been concerns the room could be used as a separate dwelling in the future however, clarification had been received from the applicant that there would be no shower room or kitchen within the proposal.

The Officer concluded his presentation by showing Member's plans and advising Officers were happy the proposal was a standard ancillary outbuilding which could be adequately controlled by condition.

The Members raised queries with the Officer which were answered in turn to their satisfaction.

There were no registered speakers for this application.

During debate, some Members queried whether condition 4, *Building to be used ancillary to the main dwelling and for no other purpose*, was adequate enough. The Officer advised it had been summarised within the report and read out the complete wording of the condition for Members' clarification.

### **Decision**

The Planning Committee unanimously agreed to **APPROVE** the planning application subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials
4. The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the existing dwelling house and not for the purposes of primary living accommodation (bedroom, living room, dining room or kitchen)
5. No windows facing no. 20

Application Number: AWDM/2129/20	
Site:	<b>60 Brighton Road, Lancing</b>
Proposal:	Retrospective application for replacement of horizontal timber screens with painted vertical screens, new balustrade to lower terrace, extended steps from ground to lower terrace and increased lower terrace width (amendment to approved application AWDM/1875/19).

*Before consideration of the above application, the Chair agreed to adjourn the meeting at 8.45pm, to be reconvened at 8.50pm.*

The Principal Planning Officer introduced the report and shared his screen to show an aerial photograph of the site. He advised that permission was granted in 2019, and that work had started last year and was now completed.

Members were advised the extension had not been built entirely in accordance with the approved plans hence the above application to be considered at the meeting.

The Officer ran through his presentation and Members were shown plans and photographs, together with a video provided by the applicant, to assist Members' consideration of the application.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

Some Members raised queries with the Officer which were answered in turn by the Officer.

There were further representations from the Ward Councillor Andy McGregor on behalf of the neighbour at Flat 5, and 2 supporters, the applicant and architect, who had all elected to join the meeting.

During debate, one Member felt that as the neighbouring flat was at a lower level they already experienced overlooking and although retrospective, tended to support the application. Following further discussion in relation to screening, the Planning Committee unanimously agreed to approve the application.

## **Decision**

The Planning Committee agreed to **APPROVE** the application subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. The additional vertical privacy screening on the east side of the lower terrace shall be put in place within 2 months from the date of this permission and shall be retained in perpetuity of the terrace.

Application Number: AWDM/2044/20	
Site:	<b>Cecil Norris House</b>
Proposal:	Retrospective application for replacement of horizontal timber screens with painted vertical screens, new balustrade to lower terrace, extended steps from ground to lower terrace and increased lower terrace width (amendment to approved application AWDM/1875/19).

The Planning Services introduced the report and advised there was nothing further to add since publication.

Before commencing his presentation, the Officer referred Members to the number of proposed changes to the scheme set out in the application proposal at the front of the report. Members were shown an aerial and street view photograph of the site, together with existing and proposed plans.

The Officer's recommendation was for approval.

Members raised no queries for clarification on the presentation.

There was further representation from a supporter who had elected to join the meeting.

### **Decision**

The Planning Committee unanimously agreed to **GRANT** permission, subject to the following conditions:-

- 01 Approved Plans
- 02 No part of the development shall be first occupied until the car parking spaces have been constructed in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated use.

**Reason:** *To provide car-parking space for the use.*

- 03 No dwelling shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking spaces serving the respective dwellings have been provided in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** *To provide alternative travel options to the use of the car in accordance with current sustainable transport policies.*

- 04 No part of the development shall be first occupied until pedestrian visibility splays have been provided either side of the proposed car parking spaces in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. These visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions over a height of 0.6 metre above adjoining carriageway level or as otherwise agreed.

**Reason:** *In the interests of road safety.*

- 05 The drainage strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the details contained in the email from Andrew Keen, HOP Consulting Civil and Structural Engineers dated 19 January 2019 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** *To ensure an adequate drainage strategy for the site.*

- 06 The development hereby permitted shall provide 100% affordable housing in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in the National Planning Policy Framework or any future guidance that replaces it.

**Reason:** *To address the specific need for affordable housing as set out in the Adur Local Plan 2017.*

- 07 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until full details of all hard and soft landscaping works and the proposed times of planting have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times. Any plants which within a period of five years from the time of planting die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

**Reason:** *In the interests of visual amenity and the environment and to comply with policies 15 and 30 of the Adur Local Plan.*

- 08 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or other openings (other than as hereby approved) shall be formed in the northern elevation of the building.

**Reason:** *To prevent overlooking and to comply with policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan.*

- 09 No work for the implementation of the development hereby permitted shall be undertaken on the site on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays. On all other days such work shall only be undertaken between the hours of 8am and 6pm.

**Reason:** *To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties having regard to policies 15 and 34 of the Adur Local Plan.*

- 10 The windows in the northern elevation of the building hereby permitted above ground floor level shall be obscure glazed and shall be permanently fixed to only allow opening up to 100mm in accordance with details to be submitted to

and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the building and they shall not subsequently be altered in any way without the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** *To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties having regard to policies 15 and 34 of the Adur Local Plan.*

- 11 Prior to the occupation of the building hereby permitted a maintenance regime for the sedum roof of the eastern part of the building shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved regime adhered to thereafter.

**Reason:** To ensure that the sustainability benefits and visual appearance of the building are preserved by adequate maintenance

### **Informatives / Notes to Applicant**

01. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
02. A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or [www.southernwater.co.uk](http://www.southernwater.co.uk). Please read our New Connections Services Charging Arrangements documents which have now been published and are available to read on our website via the following link <https://beta.southernwater.co.uk/infrastructurecharges>

It is the responsibility of the developer to make suitable provision for the disposal of surface water. Part H3 of the Building Regulations prioritises the means of surface water disposal in the order

- a Adequate soakaway or infiltration system
- b Water course
- c Where neither of the above is practicable sewer

Southern Water supports this stance and seeks through appropriate Planning Conditions to ensure that appropriate means of surface water disposal are proposed for each development. It is important that discharge to sewer occurs only where this is necessary and where adequate capacity exists to serve the development. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer the prior approval of Southern Water is required.

Due to changes in legislation that came into force on 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer

will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or [www.southernwater.co.uk](http://www.southernwater.co.uk)".