

# Public Document Pack

## Minutes of a meeting of the Adur Planning Committee 28 September 2022 at 7.00 pm

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

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

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/29/22-23 Substitute Members**

Cllr Paul Mansfield substituted for Cllr Vee Barton  
Cllr Jude Harvey substituted for Cllr Carol O'Neal

### **ADC-PC/30/22-23 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **ADC-PC/31/22-23 Public Question Time**

A member of the gallery asked a question that had not been previously submitted.

Barb O'Kelly (AREA) asked -

*My question tonight relates to parking provision in the immediate area around New Rd, Surrey St, Ham Rd, Tarmount Lane and Brighton Rd. I have some statistics providing background to the questions so please bear with me for the next 2 minutes.*

*The total shortfall of parking provision is approximately 270 spaces for already approved developments in the immediate area. A solution on the over spill of 60 vehicles from Focus is awaited.*

*If Frosts and Focus is included the shortfall will increase to around 400.*

*If half the new residents do not own cars there will be a large shortfall which the local area cannot accommodate. This will lead to driver stress, traffic churn, increased pollution and quoting a comment from the police, disharmony.*

*A parking survey was done this week at 4 am. There were 70 available spaces, 50 in Tarmount Lane car park, 15 in parking bays and others on single yellow lines where restrictions start at 8am. A survey done at 3pm indicated there were 7 free spaces.*

*West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments states in 4.2 that "parking should be sufficient to accommodate parking demand while exploiting the potential for sustainable travel and avoiding increased on-street parking demand.*

*Our first question is; Has the cumulative effect of the shortfalls in parking spaces been considered when these developments were approved?*

*Our second question is; What is the Council's plan for alleviating the parking shortfall caused by the approval of so many developments with levels of parking provision well below the standards set in the West Sussex parking Calculator?*

The Head of Planning and Development, James Appleton, responded -

*Parking is always an issue on any new development and certainly discussions with West Sussex do look at the cumulative impact. Many of the discussions around the developments coming forward are in relation to parking standards and provisions that have been provided on adjoining sites. Part of the analysis of developments in particularly sustainable locations follows government guidance that priority should be given to looking at sustainable transport, pedestrian and cycle movements, rather than making provision for the car. In terms of analysis on individual applications, it looks at the shortfall of that application but also has a regard to parking provision of developments approved. The developments in Shoreham town and in the Western Harbour Arm have been very much supported on the basis of emphasis on sustainable transport as being the alternative and reducing car provision to encourage sustainable transport which is fully in line with government policy. There may be a significant shortfall if you look at it as if every resident had a car but if we had that situation we'd only be adding to the congestion and air quality problems of the area. So clearly that's not the answer. It has to be to encourage more sustainable modes of transport and particularly in very highly accessible locations that are close to buses, the railway station and with cycle provision and so it is part of the County Council's overall strategy to reduce levels of parking provision and encourage sustainable transport. It is below the County standards and individual applications have to assess whether that level of provision is appropriate. That is one of the considerations for the Planning Committee on individual applications. The Local Plan is being reviewed and we are also looking, in particular, at the Western Harbour Arm, but I doubt that would change the emphasis on sustainable transport. That will have to be reviewed in terms of looking at the cumulative impact of the development and whether there should be any emerging change to policies. The County standard that was adopted in 2019 did look at reducing parking provision, particularly in sustainable locations. We also need to look at the latest census data because that might also give us an indication of actual car parking provision for existing residents in town centre locations.*

Barb O'Kelly (AREA) asked -

*Can you clarify that you said that parking considerations for other developments would be influenced by the parking consideration for a development that is already approved with a small number?*

The Head of Planning and Development, James Appleton, responded -

*I can confirm that the County Council, when looking at car parking provision on an individual development, would also have regard to car parking provision on sites that had already received planning permission in the locality and part of that is the transport assessment that looks at parking provision would look at a whole range of data to determine what's appropriate for an individual site but we would look at the cumulative impact.*

Barb O'Kelly (AREA) asked -

*Do you have a plan for alleviating the parking stress that there will be?*

The Head of Planning and Development, James Appleton, responded -

*The plan is to reduce the demand for parking coming forward with new developments so that's the issue. Whether the County Council considers wider issues with the District Council's parking pressures on roads within the town and potential solutions, is for the County Council to look at. As far as these developments and individual applications, it's an assessment of whether the level of provision is appropriate, given other travel plan initiatives with the application and whether the parking provision is appropriate given the travel plan measures that are incorporated. The wider parking issues that are already in existence would be something that we'd need to discuss further with the County Council in terms of a wider plan for Shoreham town centre.*

The Officer also committed to providing a written response after the meeting.

#### **ADC-PC/32/22-23    Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

#### **ADC-PC/33/22-23    Planning Applications**

The planning application was considered, see attached appendix.

#### **ADC-PC/34/22-23    Planning Appeals**

None to report.

---

The meeting ended at 9.16 pm

**Chair**

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/1473/21</b>	<b>Recommendation - to delegate to Head of Planning and Development to approve subject to satisfactory consultee comments, completion of s106 and imposition of conditions.</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>69 - 75 Brighton Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Demolition of existing buildings, construction of 80no. 1 bedroom and 103no. 2 bedroom residential apartments and commercial development over 4 blocks between 5 and 9 levels, basement parking and raised deck, new highway access, flood defences, drainage infrastructure, landscaping and ancillary development.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Shoreham Brighton Road Ltd	<b>Ward: St Mary's</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	Waller Planning	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Stephen Cantwell	

Prior to the presentation the Chair and the Head of Planning and Development clarified the wording of the amended recommendation within the addendum explaining that the Planning Committee members decided whether the recommendation was agreed with or rejected. If it was agreed with, issuing the decision to the applicant would then be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to ensure the Council received satisfactory comments from outstanding consultees and the completion of the s106 Agreement.

The Head of Planning and Development delivered the presentation encompassing details within the report including how the proposed development would sit within the surrounding area, parking provision offered, sustainable energy plans, drainage issues, affordable housing offered and S106 contributions.

Members of the committee had questions for the Head of Planning and Development regarding Highway's plans for the contribution money and it was suggested that it would be beneficial if members could be provided with a list of their spending priorities. The Officer clarified that The JAAP study had such a list and he agreed to circulate this to Members.

The Committee Members also raised questions regarding the parking provision, air quality issues, housing requirements figures and disposal of waste water. Discussion was held regarding problems around these issues that may increase with the addition of this large proposed development.

There were two registered speakers who delivered representations in objection to the application. They covered issues including flood defences, waste water disposal, increased traffic and worsened air quality.

One Ward Councillor delivered a representation in objection to the application which concentrated on parking provision, possible un-occupation of the commercial units and waste water issues.

The applicant's agent gave a representation in support of the application. He focused on the two and a half years of engagement that had been held prior to this application being submitted and clarified that the proposed site planned to use no fossil fuels, offered increased biodiversity and a car club facility.

Members had questions for the applicant's agent regarding viability and the S106 contribution.

During debate a Councillor spoke about the developers briefing for Members that had been held two days prior to this Committee meeting. The Head of Planning and Development clarified that these briefings were useful on this type of large application as there was so much information to consider but stressed that all information imparted at the briefing was already in the public domain and that members were advised to attend with an open mind.

Other issues discussed continued to address concerns around overdevelopment of the area, increased traffic and parking problems, infrastructure concerns around facilities such as schools and GP surgeries. Members discussed that issues such as these should be tackled before another large development went ahead.

A proposal was put forward to defer this application to allow the applicant to submit a scheme of a reduced scale to address some of the drainage, waste water and traffic issues. However the applicant, who was present, stated they were not in favour of a deferment and would prefer a decision on the application being considered at this meeting. In light of this, the proposal was withdrawn.

A second proposal was put forward to **Reject** the application on the grounds that the proposed development by reason of its overall density, height, scale, bulk and massing would result in an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character and visual amenities of the locality and would result in an under provision of parking and open space contrary to policy CA7 of the Shoreham Harbour Joint Area Action Plan, 2019 and Policies 8, 15, 28 & 32 & of the Adur Local Plan 2017.

This proposal was seconded and voted on, there were 6 votes in favour, 0 against and 3 abstentions.