

Public Document Pack

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Adur Planning Committee
3 June 2024
at 6.30 pm**

Councillor Dan Flower (Chair)
Councillor Andrew Harvey (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Carol Albury
*Councillor Steve Neocleous
Councillor Carolyn Fuhrmann
Councillor Pauline Higgins

Councillor Nigel Jenner
Councillor Gerry Thompson
Councillor Julia Watts

*Absent

Officers: Planning Services Manager, Senior Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

ADC-PC/1/23-24 Substitute Members

Councillor Andy McGregor substituted for Councillor Steve Neocleous.

ADC-PC/2/23-24 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

ADC-PC/3/23-24 Public Question Time

There was one public question submitted on behalf of Mariner Point Residents Association asking the Committee to delegate Officers to hold a site meeting with Councillors, residents and the Environment Agency, at Mariners Point regarding their inadequate flood defences and to report back at a future Committee meeting. The Planning Services Manager confirmed that he would bring this to the attention of the appropriate Planning Officers who would liaise with the Chair and the Environment Agency to facilitate this.

ADC-PC/4/23-24 Members Questions

There were no pre-submitted Members questions.

ADC-PC/5/23-24 Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on **04 March 2024** be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

ADC-PC/6/23-24 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

ADC-PC/7/23-24 Planning Applications

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

The meeting ended at 7.36 pm

Chair

Application Number:	AWDM/0284/24	Recommendations - REFUSE and authorise enforcement action.
Site:	26 Riverbank, Shoreham-by-Sea	
Proposal:	Development of a replacement houseboat (Retrospective)	
Applicant:	Mr Marco Pitt	Ward: Marine
Agent:	N/A	
Case Officer:	Gary Peck	

The Planning Service Manager presented the report and explained to the Committee that the applicant had withdrawn the application as they did not consider that they needed planning permission. However, he clarified that Members were still required to consider the enforcement action aspect of the report.

In response to Members' questions the Officer explained that, in his opinion, this structure did require planning permission. In the case of a boat being moored permanently and altered in appearance once moored, then this did not require permission. However, in this case it was a pontoon that was 'moored' which the applicant had then built upon and the only case law available would suggest that planning permission was needed. The Council's Houseboat guidance stated that any structure should be of low height and nautical appearance, both recommendations which this structure did not comply with. The Officer advised that although there were a couple of other houseboats in that area which were two storey, the higher elements had been set back so as to appear less dominant.

There were oral representations given by registered speakers in objection to the structure, which drew attention to its size and dominance as well as its un-nautical appearance. They voiced concerns that the dwelling was much larger than is advised in the guidance and that it did not keep the 'open' feel of the river.

During debate members expressed views that part of the charm of the area was that all these houseboats were of different appearances but they concurred that this structure did not keep to the Houseboat Guidance regarding its size and appearance. A proposal was forwarded to agree with the Officers recommendation to take enforcement action in accordance with the proposed reason for refusal had the planning application been determined. This was seconded and voted on with an outcome of 8 votes in favour and 1 abstention.

Decision - To delegate to the Head of Planning and Development in consultation with the Head of Legal to issue enforcement action for the reason as set out in the reason for refusal for the planning application had it been determined, (*The retention of the development, by way of its size,*

massing and design fails to protect or enhance the visual character and unique quality of the area and adversely affects the amenities of residents in River Close. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies 11 and 15 of the Adur Local Plan and guidance contained within the Adur Houseboats Good Practice Guide (Revised)., to remove the unauthorised development with a compliance period of 3 months.

Application Number:	AWDM/0401/24	Recommendation - APPROVE
Site:	Unit 1, Bank House, Southwick Square, Southwick	
Proposal:	Material alterations to the South and East elevations, including new windows and doors and provision of outside seating in connection with use as a cafe.	
Applicant:	Juniper Catering	Ward: Southwick Green
Agent:	Mr Jack Tompkins, Harp & Bright Ltd	
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett	

The Planning Services Manager presented the report clarifying for members that the only aspects that needed to be considered were the external changes to the windows. In response to Members queries he confirmed that the bicycle racks would have to be removed and made assurances that they would be relocated.

During debate members concurred that it was not favourable to have the building sitting empty and unused and that this application was a great improvement on that situation.

A proposal was forwarded to approve the application as per the Officers recommendation. This was seconded and voted in favour of unanimously.

Decision - Approved subject to conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 year time limit
3. Cycle stands shall be relocated in accordance with details to be submitted to the LPA

This page is intentionally left blank