

Application Number:	AWDM/1473/21	Recommendation - to delegate to Head of Planning and Development to approve subject to satisfactory consultee comments, completion of s106 and imposition of conditions.
Site:	69 - 75 Brighton Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex	
Proposal:	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.	
Applicant:	Shoreham Brighton Road Ltd	Ward: St Mary's
Agent:	Waller Planning	
Case Officer:	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.