

Public Document Pack

Minutes of a meeting of the Adur Planning Committee 5 September 2022 at 7.00 pm

Councillor Carol Albury (Chair)
Councillor Joe Pannell (Vice-Chair)

*Councillor Vee Barton
Councillor Carol O'Neal
Councillor Julian Shinn
Councillor Jim Funnell

*Councillor Mandy Buxton
Councillor Jeremy Gardner
Councillor Dan Flower

* Absent

Officers: Head of Planning and Development, Principal Planning officer, Senior Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

ADC-PC/22/22-23 Substitute Members

Cllr Andy McGregor substituted for Cllr Vee Barton
Cllr Paul Mansfield substituted for Cllr Mandy Buxton

ADC-PC/23/22-23 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Carol O'Neal declared that, in relation to application two, she had attended a consultation meeting but had no pecuniary interest.

ADC-PC/24/22-23 Public Question Time

There was one question raised under Public Question Time.

Christine Gunter asked -

Recent research by Rightmove shows Adur to be the least affordable place in the UK for first time buyers.

First time buyers will struggle in Shoreham, Lancing and Worthing where salaries are being outpaced by strong house growth.

The average asking price for a first time buyer's home in Adur is now 11.6 times the average local salary whereas the national figure is 7.2 of the average local salary.

This is a truly shocking and for most an unattainable figure.

Therefore what help will the majority of developments along the A259 and Old Shoreham Road – highly priced and some marketed as second homes- going to be for local first time buyers.?

Head of Planning and Development, James Appleton answered -

This is an important matter for many councils in the SE and there is a similar situation in Worthing in terms of the affordability gap between average earnings and the average house prices. The key issue for many councils, particularly along the coast, is the lack of land, which has meant that Adur, in promoting its Local Plan in 2017, was not able to meet its objectively assessed future housing needs. The Local Plan Inspector back in 2017 made it clear that any allocation of sites should be minimum with an expectation to look at maximising the ability to bring forward housing on brownfield sites and on allocated sites and, through the actions of the Planning Committee, trying to ensure wherever possible the delivery of the Local Plan policy compliant 30% affordable housing.

The main issue is that many of our residents cannot afford rented accommodation let alone afford a deposit for a house or apartment. However, it is not just through the planning process that additional affordable housing can be provided. We have been very fortunate that Registered Providers like Hyde and Southern Housing have purchased sites and are using Government funding to provide more social rent and shared ownership properties than required by adopted Local Plan policies. The Council's intended disposal of the Civic Centre site is to Hyde Housing will deliver all 150 apartments as affordable homes on the site (60% of the dwellings would be shared ownership and 40% social rent). Similarly, the Kingston Wharf site will be delivering 255 affordable dwellings.

These shared ownership properties will give the ability to people to get a foot on the housing ladder whilst the social rent apartments will reduce the Council's Housing waiting lists helping to meet those in greatest housing need.

There are a number of things therefore that the Council can and is doing to address the affordability gap. In addition, the Council is looking to redevelop its own land to bring forward additional Council housing and we have various developments being built at the moment at Albion Street, Cecil Norris and at Mash Barn, Lancing.

We are also reviewing the 2017 Local Plan and we will be looking at the scope to increase the supply of new housing despite the constraints of a lack of land. Government is committed to delivering new housing and its planning policies are weighted in favour of more sustainable, higher density development to try and deliver the 300,000 homes needed to tackle the national housing shortage.

Christine Gunter asked a supplementary question -

Do any of those plans include restrictions on properties being bought as second homes?

Head of Planning and Development, James Appleton answered -

Not currently. However, this is an issue that is being looked at nationally. A number of councils have tried and failed to do this and it is difficult to restrict how land and property is sold. This of course is not an issue for the affordable rented homes I have mentioned earlier as these will be restricted to local residents in Adur.

The Chair used her discretion to allow a question from a member of the gallery that had not been submitted beforehand.

The gentleman asked -

This question relates to consultations. A recent consultation was held regarding a planning application. At this event a resident asked a representative of the developer why no one from the council was present there. Please could officers explain why this was the case?

Head of Planning and Development, James Appleton answered -

The Council generally encourages applicants to consult with communities at a pre-application stage. In this case this was an event organised by the Developer to explain how the proposals have evolved during the planning process to address comments raised by the public and planning officers. If Officers were specifically invited, they would have to make it clear to those present that it was a developer consultation and fell outside any formal consultation process run by the planning department.

ADC-PC/25/22-23 Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 08 August 2022 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

ADC-PC/26/22-23 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

ADC-PC/27/22-23 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

ADC-PC/28/22-23 Executive Member Report: Trees in Adur & The Mannings, Surry Street.

The Head of Planning and Development presented the report which focused particularly on the redevelopment of the Mannings and a line of conifer trees that had been felled. The report explored where it may be possible to tighten up procedures in relation to trees that are to be retained. It also looked at validation requirements and suggested that more detail would be required to demonstrate that indicative tree planting could be delivered and would not be affected by services particularly drainage.

The members agreed to note the report.

The meeting ended at 10.13 pm

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number:	AWDM/1481/21	Recommendation - Approve subject to a s.106 Agreement, the receipt of amended plans and outstanding consultee responses.
Site:	Land At Former 5 Brighton Road, Shoreham-By-Sea	
Proposal:	Proposed mixed-use re-development between 3 and 8 storeys comprising 21 townhouses, mixed-use apartment block of 24 flats, riverside walk, landscaping, and parking.	
Applicant:	Cayuga 011 LLP	Ward: Southwick Green
Agent:	Lewis and Co Planning SE Ltd	
Case Officer:	Stephen Cantwell	

The Head of Planning and Development delivered the report explaining that there had been an addendum added which incorporated some additional consultation, representations and information regarding noise and glazing issues, ventilation and light impacts of the development. The Officer touched upon the previous withdrawn scheme of 2017, clarifying the reduction of height and density in the current proposal. He also spoke about the lack of on site affordable housing but that a s106 contribution would be made to ensure the delivery of 5 off site affordable homes.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding the height of the proposed block of flats in relation to the adjacent buildings, parking, lighting, cycle paths, energy use and drainage issues. The Officer clarified he was not aware of any plans to stop residents of these dwellings parking on the village green car park and that this issue would be for a different committee to address. Members requested that this be formally requested through the Head of Planning. It was also asked if we could encourage sustainable energy sources and the Officer clarified that this could be added as a condition requiring the submission of an energy strategy.

Members raised questions regarding the issue of drainage being unresolved and delegated to Officers and they asked whether the holding objections had been removed. The Officer explained that the holding objection had largely been dealt with, but there was still a need for some more modelling but Officers were confident that this could be dealt with by condition. He clarified that other developments along the Western Harbour Arm had resolved drainage matters satisfactorily and the sites were easier as developments were allowed to discharge to the River. As the detailed drainage plans were expensive and took some months it was considered reasonable to impose planning conditions.

There were three registered speakers and two Ward Councillors who gave representations objecting to the application. They covered issues including affordable housing, the energy policy, drainage, the late publication of the viability study, open spaces and play areas, the Local Plan, sustainability and heritage.

There were three registered speakers, the agent, architect and applicant, who gave representations in support of the application. They clarified that they were keen to use sustainable energy sources and avoid gas boilers if at all possible. They touched on parking issues explaining that the spaces shown on the plans were in fact long enough for two cars so in reality there were more spaces than were listed.

During debate Members discussed heritage issues and the effects that the proposed development may have on the nearby listed lighthouse and that some considered the building would not compliment the adjacent Kingston Buci Conservation Area. Concerns were also raised about the minimal outside space, traffic concerns and no affordable housing offered.

A motion to reject the application was proposed on the grounds of it being in contravention of policy 21 of the Local Plan, there being no sustainable housing offered, on policy 36, there being no sustainable drainage policy, policy 18, there being no sustainable energy plan and policy 38 on heritage implications being that the effects of the proposed building on the lighthouse and conservation area was not in the public interest.

This proposal was seconded and voted on with eight in favour and one against. In consequence the application was **Rejected** for the following reasons -

The proposals in relation to the setting of the listed Kingston Buci Lighthouse, by reason of their scale, height and design, are considered to cause harm to the setting of the listed building and its significance. The harm is considered to be less than substantial but it is not considered that the public benefits of the proposal are sufficient to outweigh this harm, in particular the underprovision of affordable housing contributes to this lack of outweighing public benefit. The proposal is therefore contrary to the following Policies of the Adur Local Plan, 2017:

15 (Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm),

16 (A Strategic Approach to the Historic Environment),

17 (The Historic Environment)

21 (Affordable Housing)

Policy CA7 of the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan 2019 (including the associated paragraph 4.7.70) and paragraphs 199-205 of the NPPF, 2021

Application Number:	AWDM/0585/22	Recommendation - Delegate to approve subject to completion of s106 agreement, amended plans and receipt of outstanding consultee responses.
Site:	Land At 68 And South Of 68 To 86 Manor Hall Road, Southwick	
Proposal:	Erection of 22 residential units, with associated landscaping and access arrangements	
Applicant:	West Sussex Property Development LLP	Ward: Eastbrook
Agent:	Nexus Planning	
Case Officer:	James Appleton	

The Head of Planning and Development delivered the report explaining that there had been an addendum in which technical services had withdrawn their objection and County Highways were now satisfied and that there was a revised recommendation.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding, an ecological management plan, trees, the proposed cycle path, road safety and the s106 contribution.

There were two registered speakers who gave representations in support of the application.

During debate there was discussion about affordable housing, fencing height and proposed discussion with the school to ensure safe access. Choice of brickwork was also touched upon and the Officer agreed to add a condition that would require the applicant to share material samples with the committee through Officers.

Members proposed, seconded and voted unanimously in favour of **Approving** the recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Development to grant planning permission subject to:

- i) **The receipt of amended plans deleting 3 visitor parking spaces on the western boundary and replacing these with replacement tree and shrub planting.**
- ii) **The receipt of satisfactory comments from Technical Services regarding the revised Flood Risk Assessment**

iii) The completion of a s106 agreement securing affordable housing and the development contributions set out in the report other than minor variations agreed in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee and,

iv) Subject to the following planning conditions:

1. Amended Plans
2. Materials and Samples to be submitted
3. Landscaping - first planting season following occupation
4. Surface and foul water drainage details
5. Access - No part of the development shall be first occupied until such time as the alterations to Park Way have been constructed in accordance with the details shown on the drawing titled General Arrangement of Proposed Access Improvements Option 2 (Park Way) and numbered 2106061-08-PD02 Revision B as included in the approved Transport Statement. Reason: In the interests of road safety.
6. Provision of parking and visitor parking before occupation
7. Provision of cycle parking for each dwelling
8. Tree Felling to be undertaken outside of the bird nesting season and in line with the recommendations of the ecological and arboricultural reports
9. Tree Protection measures
10. Submission of an Ecological Management Plan (including enhancement and protection measures prior to commencement of development
11. Construction Management Plan (including hours of construction and engagement with local residents).
12. Fencing and boundary treatment to be installed prior to occupation
13. Provision of Fire Hydrants prior to the occupation of the development
14. Submission of an Ecological Protection and Enhancement Plan
15. Removal of permitted development rights for roof alterations and additional windows at first floor level.
16. Provision of obscure glazing (as opposed to an applied finish) for bathroom windows on the north and east elevations of Plots 5 - 16 inclusive).