

Public Document Pack

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Adur Planning Committee
3 October 2022
at 7.00 pm**

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

Councillor Jeremy Gardner
Councillor Carol O'Neal
Councillor Vee Barton
Councillor Mandy Buxton

Councillor Dan Flower
Councillor Jim Funnell
Councillor Julian Shinn

Officers: Planning Services Manager, Principal Planning Officer, Adur Planning Policy Manager, Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

ADC-PC/35/22-23 Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

ADC-PC/36/22-23 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Vee Barton declared that the second planning application in item 6 on the agenda was made by her neighbour. She declared she has never spoken to the neighbour about the application.

ADC-PC/37/22-23 Public Question Time

James Breckell asked (read out by Gary Peck, Planning Services Manager) -

I would like to address the Planning Committee with regard to the unreasonable application of planning conditions in regard to rainwater design.

The Council's Engineers often use 'holding objections' and ask applicants to consider rainwater drainage as part of the planning application process. This is unreasonable and has the effect of stifling the supply of housing.

Gary Peck, Planning Services Manager, responded -

Drainage is an issue for a number of planning applications. Often those brought to Committee have drainage conditions attached. A number of applications haven't reached Committee yet because there are objections on drainage grounds. It is correct that these are looked at carefully as there is a drainage issue across the district. If there isn't sufficient drainage information with an application at the outset it is usual that the

Council's Technical Services Section will raise a holding objection to those applications. If that happens we try to work out a resolution but, generally, those applications don't come to committee. The applications that do come before Committee are the ones where such information has been provided and potentially negotiated with applicants. Members have said in the past that, even then, they don't feel there is enough information in those reports so a conclusion could be drawn from this that it is an important issue for, not only applicants but members, officers and residents alike. I appreciate that we should never stifle the supply of housing but at this stage we seek as much information as we can to allow the Committee to make their decisions and only when we've got to a point where we can feel confident that there will be no issues do we bring them to the Committee for consideration.

Chrissie Gunter (AREA) asked -

My question relates to the Brief for Review of Western Harbour Arm.

Pt. 3.3 proposes that a Design Code could be delivered and suggests more public participation.

I believe the Council has consulted the Coastal West Sussex Design Review Panel for past developments and this appears to have resulted in uniformly, ugly, brown buildings.

Will there be more imagination in future. Does the Council look at other attractive coastal developments and how will local residents be involved in decision making?

Moira Hayes, Adur Planning Policy Manager, responded -

The paper you're referring to is talking about the National Design Code and that is a process for assessing districts, areas or sites and looking at the details and providing a vision and guidelines as to how development might come forward in those particular areas. As part of its process the National Design Code involves public participation, its part of its methodology. The Coastal West Sussex Design Review Panel looks at planning applications and my colleague Gary Peck will enlarge on that.

Gary Peck, Planning Services Manager, responded -

When a major application is submitted, as part of the determination of the application, before it comes to Committee, the Design Review Panel may be consulted as a consultee. They can provide comments and sometimes guidance to an applicant, who may or may not take into account that advice. A major planning application has to come to Committee and they are entitled to take into account design during their determinations. Residents are also consulted at the same time as the Design Review Panel and any comments received from them are fully incorporated in the report for members to consider.

Chrissie Gunter (AREA) asked -

How will residents be able to participate? I know from being involved with AREA that many residents dislike the design of most of the developments that have been approved, such as Kingston Wharf and Free Wharf.

Gary Peck, Planning Services Manager, responded -

I can only speak on the planning application aspect. Anyone can comment on a planning application and all those comments are reported. It is perfectly valid for residents to use

examples of other developments in their comments and in some ways that makes for more useful comments.

Chrissie Gunter (AREA) asked -

In this brief it actually says it's going to encourage public participation more than just making comments about planning applications.

Moira Hayes, Adur Planning Policy Manager, replied -

The Design code process is very new, only being published in Oct 2021. The government is running pilot schemes which Adur District Council are not involved with. The authorities that are in these pilot schemes are involving their communities at different levels. Some are looking at whole districts, some at small sites and some at areas. It's all about getting people involved in setting out broad principles and looking at aspects such as materials etc. We don't have a start date for this process yet or details of exactly how it's going to work, but we will keep residents informed when we can. The Government Design Code is a detailed methodology and we may need to work with a consultant who is used to both the planning process and working with the community.

ADC-PC/38/22-23 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/39/22-23 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

ADC-PC/40/22-23 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

ADC-PC/41/22-23 Brief for Review of Western Harbour Arm, Shoreham Harbour

The Adur Planning Policy Manager delivered the report explaining why the review had been launched and covering its objectives, outcomes and timescales.

Members had questions for the Officer and the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Strategic Planning covering subjects as follows -

- how the review may alter the Local Plan and influence any infrastructure plans
- modelling of open spaces
- how members can influence the types of applications coming forward
- changing mind-sets surrounding car usage & improving public transport to allow this
- possible public involvement
- sustainability matters

Resolved: Members agreed to note the report.

ADC-PC/42/22-23 Planning Appeals

There were none to report.

The meeting ended at 8.53 pm

Chair

Application Number:	AWDM/1230/22	Recommendation - APPROVE, subject to s106
Site:	Ashcroft, 100 Kingston Lane, Shoreham-by-sea	
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing main building, retention of the existing bungalows and construction of a new three-storey residential building with ancillary works	
Applicant:	Adur and Worthing Councils	Ward: Southwick Green
Agent:	Lewis & Co Planning	
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett	

The Principal Planning Officer delivered the report explaining the slightly changed recommendation from the agenda as follows -

To approve the development with the final decision to issue the planning permission to be delegated to the Head of Planning once the S106 agreement has been completed.

Members had questions for the Officer around drainage, infrastructure and landscaping.

There was one registered speaker in support of the application and Members had questions for him regarding surface water and sustainability.

During debate the Members agreed that this was a favourable application and an improvement on the existing structure. The Committee requested that the Planning Officers arrange for the choice of brick to be brought before them before construction commenced. A motion to approve was proposed, seconded and voted in favour of unanimously.

Note: Cllr Funnell would like the brickwork used at Eastbrook Primary School to be considered for use in this development.

Resolved: Application **Approved** and left with the Head of Planning to issue decision on completion of s106 Agreement to secure a highways contribution of £22,649 and subject to the following conditions -

- 1. Approved Plans**
- 2. Standard time limit**
- 3. Landscaping to be approved**
- 4. Vehicle parking and turning to be provided**
- 5. Cycle parking to be provided**
- 6. Construction management plan to be submitted**
- 7. Tree protection to be provided in accordance with submitted details**
- 8. Drainage details to be agreed**
- 9. Samples of external materials to be approved**
- 10. Ecological enhancement measures to be provided as detailed in application**
- 11. Sustainability measures to be provided as detailed in application**
- 12. Waste storage provision as per submitted details**
- 13. Boundary treatment details to be submitted and approved**
- 14. Sample panel of flint wall to be constructed on site**
- 15. Occupancy to be limited to persons of 55 years and older**

Application Number:	AWDM/1633/21	Recommendation - APPROVE
Site:	The Old Town Hall, 142 Albion Street, Southwick	
Proposal:	Erection of a new three storey office building, with ground floor parking under.	
Applicant:	Hall Homes Ltd	Ward: Eastbrook
Agent:	Turner Associates	
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett	

The Principal Planning Officer delivered the report explaining the proposal.

Members had questions for the Officer regarding parking, obscure windows at the rear of the proposed structure, and brickwork to be used.

There was one registered speaker in support of the application and Members had questions for him regarding the proposed brickwork, loss of current parking area, office space usage and traffic control.

During debate although concerns were raised regarding the visual aspects of the proposed development, many Members felt it was an improvement to the area. Members stressed the importance that the brickwork must match that of the Old Town Hall adjacent to the site.

A motion to approve was proposed and seconded. Members voted with eight votes in favour and one abstention.

Resolved: Application **Approved** with the provision that external materials be approved in consultation with Members (they wish materials to match those on the Town Hall) and Condition 8 to be amended to include requirement for submission of details of measures to prevent parking taking place on the pavement and subject to the following conditions:-

1. **Standard time limit**
2. **Contaminated Land**
3. **External materials to be approved**
4. **Rear windows to be obscure glazed**
5. **Construction Management Plan to include control over hours of construction**

- 6. Surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved prior to commencement**
- 7. Class E (g) (i) use only and no other purpose**
- 8. Car parking to be provided with EV charging spaces**
- 9. Cycle parking to be provided**
- 10. Development to achieve BREEAM Excellent standard and to include provision for future District Heating Network, in accordance with details to be provided.**
- 11. Details of solar panels and location of air source heat pumps to be submitted and approved**
- 12. Details of measures to protect**

Application Number:	AWDM/0123/22	Recommendation - APPROVE
Site:	20 Lancing Close, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 9NJ	
Proposal:	Application for consent under Adur Tree Preservation Order No. 13.53/1/01 (L) of 2001 to pollard at 14 to 16 metres to above previous points Poplar trees T3, T4, T5 and T6.	
Applicant:	Mrs Ruth Nicol	Ward: Manor
Agent:	Mr Stephen Duance South Coast Tree Care Ltd	
Case Officer:	Jeremy Sergeant	

This application was removed from the agenda after publication due to the applicant being unavailable to attend the meeting to answer Members questions.

This page is intentionally left blank