

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0941/23</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>1 The Street, Lancing</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Change of use from groundsman's shed to workshop with storage area and quiet room for social, educational and recreational activities. Application to vary condition 2 of approved AWDM/0630/23 to allow working outside the building</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Men In Sheds Lancing And Sompting</b>	<b>Ward: Manor</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Frank King</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Peter Barnett</b>	

*Councillor Carol Albury left the room owing to declared interests in the application. Councillor Joe Pannell chaired this item.*

The Planning Services Manager presented the application report explaining that it sought to amend condition 2 on the current permission to allow working outside.

There were two registered speakers who gave representations in objection to the application. They explained the grounds on which they objected, clarifying that they had concerns over noxious chemical fumes and possible use of spray painting equipment.

The Ward Councillor, Cllr Carson Albury gave a representation in support of the application. He clarified for the Committee members that the Men in Sheds intended to use non-toxic water based paint which would always be applied by hand. No use of spray painting equipment would ever occur.

Two members of Men in Sheds gave representations in support of the application. They described the benefit that the Men in Sheds had provided to its members and the local area. They reiterated the fact that only non-toxic hand painting would take place and assured the Committee that any lacquering would continue to be performed inside.

During debate Members discussed possible noise pollution resulting from outside working at the Men in Sheds site. They concurred that, as the group were already restricted to certain working hours, and that no non-manual equipment was to be used, this was not a concern. The Planning Services Manager confirmed for members that it would be possible to add a note to the applicants on the permission that specifically stipulated there should be no spray painting and advising the Men in Sheds that if an application was ever submitted requesting permission to spray paint at the site, it was unlikely to be supported by the Council..

A proposal was put forward to approve the application with the addition of the suggested note regarding spray painting. This was seconded and voted on with a unanimously in favour outcome.

### **Recommendation**

**Approve - Note to applicant to be added confirming that spray painting outside would require planning permission and that any such application is unlikely to be supported by the Council.**

### **Subject to conditions:-**

1. Approved Plans
2. No external working (other than hand painting and staining of wooden products) or storage shall take place anywhere on the site to which this permission relates and all working shall be confined to within the buildings.
3. The buildings shall not be used except between the hours of 7.30am-4pm Monday-Friday and 8am-4pm on Saturdays. There shall be no use of machinery or dispatch of deliveries at the premises except between the hours of 8.45 am and 4.00 pm on Mondays to Saturdays inclusive.  
The buildings shall not be used at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays.
4. The premises shall be used as a workshop Class E(g) (iii), for storage (Class B8) and as a meeting place for the local community (Class F2(b)) as set out in the application and for no other purpose within Class E, F or B8 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or in any provision equivalent to that class in any Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).
5. There shall be no external alterations to the buildings without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
6. No retail sales shall take place from the buildings at any time.
7. The toilet building shall be permanently removed from the site on cessation of the current use of the buildings as workshop and meeting place for the local community

Informative: The applicant is reminded that there should be no external storage anywhere on the site and all materials should be confined to within the buildings.

<b>Application Number:</b>	<b>AWDM/0879/23</b>	<b>Recommendation - APPROVE</b>
<b>Site:</b>	<b>111 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-sea</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Remodelling of existing bungalow, including two storey rear extension and extension to roof, to create a two storey flat roofed dwelling with stairwell access to roof and front balcony. Application to vary condition 1 (approved plans) of AWDM/0213/22. Amendments: changes to balcony privacy screens; changes to windows including new obscure glazed windows to side elevations</b>	
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Mr and Mrs Spiers</b>	<b>Ward: Marine</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Mr Scott Evans</b>	
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Peter Barnett</b>	

The Planning Services Manager presented the report highlighting an error and explaining that the house numbers referred to on page 16 of the report in paragraph 4, should be reversed. He clarified that this was a retrospective application seeking to retain some design changes that had been incorporated into the structure.

There was one registered speaker who gave a representation in objection to the application. He voiced concerns regarding loss of privacy and overlooking of his bedroom from the neighbouring balcony caused by a change in the screen design. He expressed his view point that some of the additions were out of keeping with the style of the rest of the house and he was uneasy that the mesh that had been installed would flap and cause noise in high winds.

The agent and applicant delivered representations in support of the application and clarified that the design changes incorporated had been minor and that the change made to the style of the balcony screen was for aesthetic reasons.

Members had questions for the speakers regarding the balcony screen design, the mesh that had been installed and the overlooking concerns. Some Members concurred that the 1.8 m high balcony screen design should have been as per the original plans. A proposal was put forward to defer the application to allow the applicant to consider amending the western first floor balcony screen to 1.8 metres in height and resubmit the application. This was seconded and voted on with an outcome of 5 in favour and 4 against.

**Decision - Application deferred to consider amending western first floor balcony screen to 1.8 metres in height.**