

Application Number: NOTICE/0014/20	
Site:	Penhill Court, Penhill Road, Lancing
Proposal:	Application for Prior Approval for construction of two additional storeys of 5no. new dwellings immediately above the existing detached block of flats.

The Planning Services Manager introduced the report and advised Members one further letter of objection had been received, since the papers had been published, on the grounds of increased loss of privacy and loss of light. He further advised a response had been received from the Legal Services Officer who was satisfied that Shoreham Airport was an aerodrome for the purposes of the General Permitted Development Order.

Members were shown an aerial photograph of the site, plans and photographs to assist in their consideration of the application.

The Planning Services Manager referred back to the advice from Legal Services, and advised Members the application was not submitted under the correct procedure. It had been submitted under the amended Prior Approval procedure, a set of new rules that came into effect during the summer, set down by the Government, that lessened the restrictions on adding additional storeys to buildings. As Penhill Court was within 3 kilometres of an aerodrome then full planning permission would be required and therefore the application should be resisted on that basis.

In concluding his presentation, he advised the Officer's recommendation was that Prior Approval should be refused for the reasons set out within the report.

There were further representations from three supporters who had elected to join the meeting.

Members thanked the speakers for their representations and during debate the consensus appeared to be that the block of flats was already vast and the proposal for an additional two storeys would be out of keeping in the area and unfair to residents and neighbouring properties.

The Committee Members voted unanimously in favour of the Officer's recommendation to refuse the application for the reasons set out below.

Decision

That the planning application be **REFUSED**, for the following reasons:-

The proposed development would, by reason of its large scale and height result in an imposing development which would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings in terms of loss of light, privacy and overbearing impact. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan.

The application site is within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome and therefore the proposal does not constitute permitted development under Class A, Part 20, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015

Application Number: AWDM/0989/20	
Site:	Land south of 17 to 19 Victoria Road, Shoreham-by-Sea
Proposal:	Construction of two-storey detached 2 bedroom dwellinghouse, with balcony to east, including 2no. parking spaces and bin and bike storage.

The Planning Services Manager outlined the application and Members were shown an aerial view of the application site, at the western end of Victoria Road, together with various plans, photographs and CGIs.

The Officer's recommendation was to approve the application.

There were further representations from an objector and supporter. The objector had elected not to join the meeting so her representation was read out by the Planning Services Manager.

During debate, some Members, whilst sympathising with the concerns of neighbours, felt the contemporary design would fit comfortably alongside the more traditional forms of housing. However, others were of the opinion the proposed development would be out of keeping in the area and therefore could not support the application.

A proposal was put forward by Councillor Stephen Chipp to refuse the application, against the Officer's recommendation, and seconded by Councillor Lee Cowen, for the reason the design and form of development was out of keeping with the surrounding character of the area.

A vote was taken by roll call and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Albury, Chipp, Cowen and Loader

Against: Councillors Balfe, Boram, Coomber and McGregor

Abstentions: 0

The Chair used her casting vote and the application was refused.

Decision

Planning permission was **REFUSED**, on the grounds the design, form and massing of the development was out of context with the character of the surrounding area.

It was agreed the Planning Services Manager would draft the reason for refusal, which would be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair prior to the issue of the decision notice.

Agree wording: The proposed development by virtue of its siting, design, form and massing would result in a discordant development which would be out of keeping with the character of the immediately surrounding development. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Application Number: AWDM/0975/20	
Site:	26 Windlesham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and rear extension. Proposed two-storey side and rear extension with matching roof height, to east and north elevations, rear dormer to north roof slope, single-storey front extension with porch and single-storey rear extension. Alterations to fenestration on east elevation (Amendment to previously approved AWDM/0283/20 for enlarged rear extension).

Before the presentation on the application, Councillors Carol Albury and Kevin Boram were moved into the waiting room by the Democratic Services Officer.

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Stephen Chipp chaired the item.

The Planning Services Manager outlined the proposal and Members were shown an aerial view of the application site, together with various plans, and photographs.

The Officer advised the recommendation was to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Councillor Kevin Boram, as Ward Councillor for Buckingham, addressed the Committee to explain his reasons for requesting the application be brought to Committee for consideration.

Following his representation, the DSO moved the Councillor back into the waiting room and there followed further representations from two supporters, who had elected to join the meeting.

During debate, the majority of Members were minded to overturn the Officer's recommendation to refuse, and grant planning permission. It was felt the length and width of the garden would easily accommodate the 6 metre single storey extension and the depth of the extension would not adversely affect the neighbour.

A proposal was put forward by Councillor David Balfe to approve the application, against the Officer's recommendation, and seconded by Councillor Lee Cowen.

A vote was taken by roll call and the vote was as follows:

For: Councillors Balfe, Chipp, Cowen and Loader

Against: Councillors Coomber and McGregor

Abstentions: 0

Decision

That planning permission be **GRANTED**.

(Case Officer to impose conditions as per previous approval).

Councillor Albury and Boram were both moved back in the meeting from the waiting room to consider Item 7 on the agenda.