

# Public Document Pack

**Minutes of a meeting of the  
Adur Planning Committee  
1 July 2024  
at 6.30 pm**

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

Councillor Carol Albury  
Councillor Carolyn Fuhrmann  
Councillor Pauline Higgins  
Councillor Nigel Jenner

Councillor Steve Neocleous  
Councillor Gerry Thompson  
Councillor Julia Watts

**Officers:** The Head of Planning and Development, Planning Services Manager, Principal Planning Officer, Senior Lawyer and Democratic Services Officer

---

## **ADC-PC/8/24-25     Substitute Members**

There were no substitute members.

## **ADC-PC/9/24-25     Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Steve Neocleous declared that he worked for Silverstone Communications who have undertaken the stakeholder engagement with regards to AWDM/0202/24 and so he would be absenting himself from the meeting for the duration of that application.

Councillor Andrew Harvey declared that, in relation to application AWDM/0202/24, he was a committee member of AREA who had provided comments on the application and so he would also be absenting himself from the meeting for the duration of that application.

Councillor Nigel Jenner declared that, in relation to application AWDM/0407/24, he was the Buckingham Ward Councillor and so had been approached by and had discussions with his constituents regarding the application. However, he was not predetermined and would hear the application with an open mind.

Councillor Carol Carroll Albury declared that, in relation to AWDM/0243/24, she was a Parish Councillor but had not been involved with this application and was not predetermined.

## **ADC-PC/10/24-25     Public Question Time**

There were no pre-submitted Public Questions.

## **ADC-PC/11/24-25     Members Questions**

There were no pre-submitted Members Questions.

**ADC-PC/12/24-25 Confirmation of Minutes**

**RESOLVED**, that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on **3 June 2024** be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chair.

**ADC-PC/13/24-25 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions**

There were no items raised under urgency provisions.

**ADC-PC/14/24-25 Planning Applications**

The planning applications were considered, see attached appendix.

**ADC-PC/15/24-25 Appeals Decision Update**

Members noted the appeals update.

**ADC-PC/16/24-25 Proposed Revision to Pre-Application Charging (Adur) 2024 Report**

Members considered the proposed changes to the Councils Charging Schedule and agreed to recommend to the Adur and Worthing Executive Members for Regeneration that the following charges were adopted by both Councils to be implemented from the 1st April 2023.

---

The meeting ended at 10.29 pm

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0202/24</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>The Haven, Brighton Road, Lancing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Part 1-storey, part 2-storey rooftop extension to develop 9no. residential units; and associated works</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Chalice Properties Ltd</b>	<b>Ward: Widewater</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Washbourne Consulting Ltd</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Peter Barnett</b>	

*Councillors Neocleous and Harvey left the meeting for the duration of this application.*

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report explaining that since agenda publication there had been nine further objections from residents, two of which had been forwarded to Members before the meeting at the request of the objectors. He also confirmed that West Sussex Highways had no objection to the revised parking layout. He clarified that the land to the north of the property, which had been County Council owned, had been sold to a private buyer and had planning permission for housing.

The Officer demonstrated for members that the existing levels would continue to have individual entrances and those levels would not interlink internally whereas the two new levels would be accessed by one entrance for the entire floors. He also confirmed parking space details and stated that without the hedge removal there would be 52 parking spaces, including existing garages.

There were three registered speakers who gave representations objecting to the application on grounds including overdevelopment and disruption to the area's character and open and exposed nature. They also explained that the hedges the proposal planned to remove were over 30 years old and provided a great deal of biodiversity. The speakers raised concerns regarding the possible removal of asbestos during construction and there were some concerns that only residents of the new floors would have access to terraces from which the green roof would be visible.

There was one representation from the Ward Councillor who spoke in support of the application on behalf of a resident who preferred to not speak themselves. He demonstrated that there were no sound reasons to refuse the application on planning grounds as well as there being no objection from consultees on policy matters. He also brought to light details within the residents lease which stated that the landlord was at liberty to alter the property as they saw fit.

There were three speakers who gave representations in support of the application. They explained how they had strived to keep the character of the building whilst

enhancing it. In response to members' questions they agreed that they would be willing to consider leaving the hedge in place and have discussions about introducing batteries for the PV panels. They reassured members that if there was asbestos present in the areas that were to be altered it would be removed safely. As no alterations would involve individual flats there should be no need for residents to vacate their properties.

With regards to energy and sustainability, heating and hot water the speakers reassured Members that the proposal included better insulation for the entire building and that the solar panels would benefit all residents.

During debate Members concurred that, with the addition of some conditions, the application was a favourable one. A suggestion was made that it may be beneficial to consider reviewing the number of garages as many modern cars were too big to utilise them and extra parking spaces could be secured this way. Concerns were raised about the disruption affecting the existing residents that would be inevitable during construction and it was proposed that a favourable solution would be to provide residents with a contact that they could go to at all times regarding any such issues. In addition securing the retention of the hedge and ensuring that gas boilers were not used were seen as appropriate issues that should be covered by condition.

A proposal was put forward to approve the application with extra conditions that the hedge would be retained, that air source heat pumps were used instead of gas boilers and that batteries were installed for the PV panels. In addition the construction management plan should include a requirement that residents be given a contact number so they would have someone to contact at all times during construction, if problems arose and that condition 12 should include details of how the sustainability and energy efficiency measures would benefit the residents of The Haven as a whole. This was seconded and voted in favour of unanimously.

**Decision - Approved with decision delegated to Head of Planning and Development to issue on receipt of satisfactory amended plans showing retention of hedge and revised parking layout, and with re-consultation with WSCC Highways and subject to conditions:-**

1. Approved Plans
2. Time limit
3. Materials to be submitted and approved
4. CMP, to include submission of details of contact for resident liaison during construction
5. Hours of construction
6. Surface water drainage disposal details to be agreed
7. Surface water maintenance and management to be agreed
8. Foul sewage disposal details to be submitted and agreed
9. Car and cycle parking to be provided as shown on plans
10. To incorporate noise mitigation measures as recommended in the noise impact assessment
11. Landscaping details to be agreed

12. Final details of sustainability measures to be agreed, including details of how these will benefit existing residents
13. Green roof to be biodiverse green roof in accordance with final details to be agreed
14. Ecological enhancement measures to be submitted and agreed
15. Submission of bird hazard management plan for green roof
16. Submission of glint and glare assessment of solar panels to be agreed prior to installation

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0163/24</b>	<b>Recommendation - REFUSE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>42 Brighton Road, Lancing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a 4-bedroom detached dwelling over 3 levels with rear terrace and associated works. New outbuilding with raised terrace to the south. New detached garage with guest bedroom over and cycle store to the north. Application to Vary Condition 1 (approved plans) of previously approved AWDM/0923/21. Amendments: Inclusion of a trellis/privacy screen along the area of terrace next to the sunken seating as part of proposed landscaping scheme</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Mr Mario Bernard</b>	<b>Ward: Widewater</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Domus Architecture Ltd</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Peter Barnett</b>	

The Head of Planning and Development presented the report explaining that this application was linked with application AWDM/0970/23 and so would be considered simultaneously. He explained the history of the applications clarifying that they were both previously considered at the committee on 4th March 2024.

The first application dealt with an amended proposal to add a privacy screen and landscaping to mitigate some of the impact of the development on the neighbouring property. The second application sought to retain the property as built which was higher and with some other amendments to the property. At the March committee, Members considered the amendments to the dwelling to be acceptable subject to ensuring that the balcony on the front of the building was amended to have fixed windows instead of patio doors as well as further clarification regarding the garden levels. The Officer explained that since the March meeting plans had been submitted which showed windows rather than patio doors at the front with only side hung windows with 100mm restricted opening to prevent access onto the planted balcony.

The Officer explained that the development had been carried out without complying with Condition 10 of the original planning permission which required the submission and approval of details of any changes to ground levels prior to commencement. This condition has not, to date, been discharged by the applicant.

The Officer went on to explain that, since the report has been written, he had received an amended proposal to have the hedge and wall behind the patio area at a lower level (1m lower). This proposal had been submitted two days before this meeting and so the neighbour hadn't had time to consider it fully. However the

neighbours agent had indicated that the amendment did not address his clients concerns about the levels as constructed.

Members had questions regarding access to the area between the two boundary walls to allow them to be maintained. The Officer clarified that this was unclear as yet although that area of land was the property of the neighbour and not the applicant.

There were three speakers giving representations in objection to the applications. They raised issues of overlooking, overdevelopment, drainage and the overbearing aspects of the proposed boundary wall. The speakers also confirmed that they initially didn't think the amended plans of reducing the ground level by a metre would reduce the adverse impact of the raised ground levels.

There was one representation from the Ward Councillor who spoke in objection to the application. She reiterated the preceding comments regarding the overbearing aspects of the proposed fence and hedge and concurred that the amended plans did not sufficiently address the issue.

There was one speaker who gave a representation in support of the application who explained that the applicants had been striving to find a suitable compromise.

During debate members agreed that the levels of the external areas remained a concern and flood risk and drainage issues were also considered to need more investigation. There were outstanding uncertainties regarding the space between the two walls and Members also voiced reservations regarding condition 17, which pertained to the applicant providing details of the levels, and suggested it may need to be more robust. It was suggested that more discussion between the two parties to find a suitable compromise for both would be desirable and a deferment was thought to be a sensible option to allow for this.

A proposal was made to defer the application. This was seconded and voted in favour of unanimously.

**Decision - DEFERRED - to seek further compromise on ground levels and formal re-consultation with neighbours**

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0970/23</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>42 Brighton Road, Lancing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a 4-bedroom detached dwelling over 3 levels with rear terrace and associated works. New outbuilding with raised terrace to the south. New detached garage with guest bedroom over and cycle store to the north. Application to Vary Condition 1 (approved plans) of previously approved AWDM/0923/21. Amendments: Increase in height of house by 0.85m, addition of first floor balconies to front elevation, addition of lightwells to front. Increase in height to garage block by 0.37m; addition of cladding to garden room</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Mr Bernard</b>	<b>Ward: Widewater</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Paul Smith - Domus Architecture Ltd</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Peter Barnett</b>	

**As application AWDM/0163/24.**

**Decision - DEFERRED - to seek further compromise on ground levels and formal re-consultation with neighbours**



<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0243/24</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>Monks Recreation Ground, Crabtree Lane, Lancing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Sports pavilion incorporating changing, shower facilities, toilets, first aid, storage, public cafe and toilets to ground floor.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Lancing Parish Council	Ward: Mash Barn
<b>Agent:</b>	Garrick Architects	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	Peter Barnett	

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report explaining that the application was for a new sports pavilion with changing rooms, cafe, an office for Parish Council use and an equipment storage area.

He clarified some updates since the report had been published including that the Highways department had no concerns and Sports England was concerned about sight lines when doors are open, allowing views into the changing areas. It was suggested that it should be delegated to officers to obtain a revised plan to alter this aspect. The Officer also drew Members attention to a typo on page 48 of the report and explained the opening hours should read 7am - 10pm.

There was one speaker who gave a representation in support of the application who drew members attention to the advantages of the new structure including that women's football would be able to be introduced at this venue with the arrival of separate changing rooms and toilet facilities. She confirmed for members that the toilets would also be available for others to access as long as the cafe was open.

During debate Members had concerns over the possibility of vandalism and the applicant assured them this issue had been considered and a minimum of glass was to be used on the ground floor. Members also impressed upon the applicant that PV panels would be beneficial and it was suggested that a condition should be added prescribing that they be installed.

A proposal was put forward to agree with the recommendation to approve with the addition of the extra conditions mentioned. This was seconded and voted in favour of unanimously.

**Decision - APPROVED, with decision delegated to Head of Planning and Development to issue on receipt of satisfactory amended plans showing removal of sightlines into changing rooms and subject to conditions:-**

1. Approved Plans
2. Time limit
3. Materials

4. CMP
5. Tree protection
6. Surface water drainage details
7. Surface water maintenance and management details
8. Foul drainage details
9. Use Class F2 and E (b) and E (g)(i)
10. Hours of opening 7am to 10pm
11. Ecological enhancements to be provided prior to occupation
12. Landscaping
13. Requirement of details of sustainability measures/PV panels

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0407/24</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>Land South Of Buckingham Park Including South Pavilion And Cafe And Public Conveniences, Upper Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-sea</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Phased development for the demolition of existing building and erection of new pavilion building (with cafe, toilets and sports changing facilities), associated pedestrian paths and landscaped areas.</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Adur District Council</b>	<b>Ward: Buckingham</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>ECE Planning Ltd</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Peter Barnett</b>	

**Due to time constraints it was agreed that this application would be moved to the meeting on 5 August 2024 .**

This page is intentionally left blank