

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 January 2024 at 2.00 pm

Present: Councillors Hamilton (Chair), Wallsgrove (Vice-Chair), Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Kelly, Lury, McDougall, Northeast, Partridge, Patel and Woodman

521. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Woodman declared a prejudicial interest in item 8 [LU/278/23/HH 19 DAVITTS DRIVE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 6RU] as she was the applicant.

Councillor Blanchard-Cooper declared a prejudicial interest in item 8 [LU/278/23/HH 19 DAVITTS DRIVE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 6RU] as he was a friend of the applicant.

522. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 13 December 2023 and 14 December 2023 were approved and signed by the Chair.

523. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no urgent items for this meeting.

524. P/153/21/RES LAND SOUTH OF SUMMER LANE AND WEST OF PAGHAM ROAD, PAGHAM

(This application was deferred by the Committee on 13 December 2023 [Minute 465] to secure clarification as to the impact of the height of the proposed dwellings and the impact this would have on the setting of St Thomas a Beckett Church.)

No Public Speakers

APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS (APPEARANCE, LAYOUT, LANDSCAPING AND SCALE) FOLLOWING OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION P/140/16/OUT FOR THE ERECTION OF 350 NO. DWELLINGS, TOGETHER WITH PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, PLAY SPACE, DRAINAGE, PARKING AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE, LANDSCAPE, ANCILLARY AND SITE PREPARATION WORKS, WITH ACCESS OFF PAGHAM ROAD. THIS SITE MAY AFFECT A PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY.

- The Principal Planning Officer presented the report. The report set out that there had been no changes to the application since the deferral. However, the applicant had provided further informative material. An update was provided that one further

Planning Committee - 17.01.24

objection had been received that contained no additional material considerations to consider.

Members having considered the additional information provided to them concerning the dwelling ridge heights and viewpoints, were satisfied that the view pertaining to the impact on the setting of St Thomas a Becketts Church would be protected.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Partridge and seconded by Councillor Bower.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY

525. P/139/22/RES CHURCH BARTON HOUSE, HORNS LANE, PAGHAM

(This application was deferred by the Committee on 13 December 2023 [Minute 466] due to the deferral of application P/153/21/RES [Minute 465], as the proposed access for this application relied on a connection to the internal estate road provided on the adjacent application site.)

6 Public Speakers

Councillor Peter Atkins, Pagham Parish Council
Nigel Munday, Objector.
Colin Hamilton, Objector
Councillor David Huntley, Ward Member
Chris Lyons, Agent

Approval of reserved matters following P/25/17/OUT for the provision of 65 dwellings, access roads, landscaping, open space and associated works. This application affects a Public Right of Way.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report. An update was provided that one further objection had been received that had contained no additional material considerations to consider. She drew attention to a correction to page 17 of the update report and advised that the ridge heights specified of ‘...between 5.3m and 8.3m.’ should read ‘...between 4.3m and 8.4m’.

After the speakers had been heard the Principal Planning Officer was invited by the Chair to address any comments made by those who had spoken. Conditions were imposed on the outline to deal with any flooding concerns, with the council’s drainage engineers requiring surface water run off rates to be no more than the greenfield runoff rate. The drainage engineers would require details of further drainage solutions if the runoff rates were unsatisfactory, in order to address capacity and run off issues. Whilst

indicative details had been received concerning the provision of play areas, they were not part of the reserved matters and would be secured as part of the Section 106 agreement. The Greenspace Officer had no objection to the proposals for the play areas. Condition 16 (external lighting) would deal with on-site external lighting. The ecological assessment had addressed the presence of birds and reviewed by the council's ecologist who had no objections. A condition requesting details of the bird box provision would be secured at the discharge of condition stage with the number of bird boxes quoted was the minimum requirement. Condition 27 (and Condition 30 of P/153/21/RES), required more details to be submitted relating to mitigation land for the Brent Geese and was not part of members' consideration. The mitigation measures relating to the reserved matters involving reducing disturbance of the brent geese had gone through an Appropriate Assessment by the council and agreed with Natural England. Referring to the potential for bird nests, separate legislation was in place to protect birds and their nesting habitats.

Members raised the following points during the debate. Flood risk concerns were discussed and the importance of adequate drainage solutions being in place to prevent future flooding. The provision of bungalows was welcomed with clarification sought regarding their protection as bungalows. The importance of protection being in place for migrating brent geese to mitigate the effect of the development.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that with regards to the flood risk concerns raised, a surface water drainage scheme would be considered at a later stage, prior to commencement of the development. A planning condition existed on the outline planning permission and would require the applicant to submit a technical drainage scheme and calculations for approval by the drainage engineers. If changes were required that impacted the approved layout, then the reserved matters application would be required to be altered and a new application would be needed to be made. Turning to the bungalows, it was confirmed they would be one storey high and not chalet bungalows. As regards to their protection, there would not be any permitted development rights allowing an upwards extension. The protection for migrating brent geese would be secured as part of the reserved matters application.

The Group Head of Planning reminded members that, as a reserved matters application, the only matters for consideration on this application were access, layout, appearance, landscaping and scale. All other detailed matters, including drainage, had been considered at the outline application stage through the conditions attached to the outline planning permission, as set out in the report. Further details concerning drainage would be required to be submitted for approval at the discharge of condition stage. Until these details were received the drainage engineers had submitted a holding objection.

At the conclusion of the member discussion Councillor Bower proposed that in light of the concerns raised by members concerning drainage issues the discharge of conditions applications relating to drainage should be referred back to this Committee for approval. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Kelly.

The Committee

Planning Committee - 17.01.24

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVE CONDITIONALLY and the discharge of the drainage conditions be referred back to the Planning Committee for approval.

526. LU/278/23/HH 19 DAVITS DRIVE, LITTLEHAMPTON BN17 6RU

(At the start of this item Councillors Woodman and Blanchard-Cooper redeclared their Prejudicial Interests in this item made at the beginning of the meeting and left the meeting during the discussion of this item.)

No Public Speakers

The Interim Head of Development Management presented the report. The recommendation was then proposed by Councillor Bower and seconded by Councillor Patel.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY.

527. WA/111/23/PL BROOKFIELD FARM, EASTERGATE LANE, WALBERTON BN18 0BA

(Councillors Woodman and Blanchard-Cooper returned to the meeting at the beginning of this application.)

The Interim Head of Development Management drew members attention to an update to the recommendation set out in the update report. He advised that following the receipt of Southern Water's initial consultation response, officers had sought further comments from them regarding existing sewerage capacity issues in the Eastergate area. Southern Water had now updated their consultation response. The Sewer Network Manager has raised concerns about the existing network problems and the impact additional dwellings would have, possibly causing surcharging. The Future Growth Planner has advised that modelling would take place to test whether the flows from the two additional dwellings could be accommodated. He advised that having considered Southern Water's response officers were now recommending a deferral of the application to allow for the modelling to be undertaken and for wider discussions to take place with Southern Water to discuss the discrepancy with the replies that the Council was receiving during the consultation stage and to get clarity on their position regarding new development within this catchment area.

The deferral was proposed by Councillors Bower and seconded by Councillor Lury.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be DEFERRED until such time as this modelling information is available and further discussions have taken place with Southern Water.

A short adjournment was then taken by the Committee from 3.10pm to 3.17pm.

528. COMMITTEE REPORT RAMPION 2 JANUARY 2024

The Chair invited Alice Humphries, Senior Consultant from Icen Projects who provided members with a detailed presentation. An application for a Development Consent Order had been submitted by Rampion Extension Development Ltd for the Rampion 2 Offshore Wind Farm Scheme for up to 90 offshore wind turbine generators, which had been accepted by the Secretary of State. As part of the examination process, Arun District Council, as a 'host Local Authority' has been invited to submit a 'Local Impact Report' (LIR) by 20 February 2024, which was before the Committee today to consider.

Members raised a number of points during a detailed discussion on the proposals:

- The importance of the economy and concern that there had been very little study of the disadvantages and advantages regarding the economic impact wind farms had when positioned adjacent to the coastline.
- Comment was made that the economy had not been included in the assessment of impact at a local level.
- The detrimental effect on seaside towns, due to the proximity of the wind turbines to the Arun district's beaches, was a concern, as tourism would be displaced during the construction phase with tourists diverting to neighbouring areas instead.
- The impact of the cabling works on the quality of agricultural land and the need for this type of land to be reinstated to its original agricultural land classification grade.
- The issue of 'pay back' was discussed, it was of concern that there was little mention of mitigation or compensation, which it was suggested could be used towards a range of projects, such as the improvement of flood defenses at Climping.
- Treat as an asset with the right investment it may provide a positive economical uplift, providing both skilled and unskilled jobs.
- The idea of the wind farm becoming a tourist attraction was suggested by providing a visitor education centre, the 'Look and Sea Visitor Centre' was suggested as a location, and boat trips to the site.
- Concern was raised about the negative noise impact, especially at nighttime during the construction stage, which would likely be worse than the issues experienced during Rampion 1, due to a larger generating capacity for Rampion 2 and its location being closer to the coastline.

Planning Committee - 17.01.24

- A question was asked whether Arun District Council would receive any money to reinvest in the District to offset any negative impacts? It was explained that the Council's representations and the Local Impact Report had highlighted the need for mitigation measures to be in place to offset negative impact. Where mitigation was not possible a mechanism to secure compensation in the form of a Community Benefits Package had been requested and wording to this effect had been requested in the draft Development Consent Order. As regards to which communities. Further details had been requested from the applicant, who were the decision maker, as to which of the communities in Arun would benefit from such a package.

The Group Head of Planning responded to question concerning the examination stage. As regards to member involvement he advised that if the Examiner appointed by the Planning Inspectorate wanted to hear the Council's views at the examination stage, then notice would be given to the Council. At that time the Planning Committee can consider who should be involved at that stage to provide the Council's views. It was noted that the Council was not able to secure any substantial benefits requested for Rampion 1 and therefore it was not expected that Rampion 2 would either. Progress updates would be reported to the Council's Planning Briefing Panel. Alice Humphries would be the Council's representative at the examination who then explained more about the examination process.

Responding to members comments regarding a visitor centre and boat trip excursions, these were already available to the public for Rampion 1, the Group Head of Planning advised it would be difficult to request the same for Arun, as it would be expected that the applicant would use the facilities already available to serve the scheme as a whole.

The recommendations were proposed by Councillor Wallsgrove and seconded by Councillor Lury.

The Group Head of Planning provided additional advice on the suitability of the amendments to the LIR requested by members during their discussion. In relation to comments made by members surrounding the provision of flood defences at Climping, it was not possible to request a continual pay back for any negative impacts caused to the community. Referring the comments made by members concerning the visual impact and employment impact, he advised members that the LIR already referred to these impacts.

The Committee requested that the LIR should be amended to take into account the following:

- Make reference to the potential for the provision of a Visitor Centre within the Arun District to encourage tourism to the area.
- Request that the onshore cable corridor do not disturb the road surface of the proposed Lyminster bypass.

- To further highlight the importance of the tourism economy in the Arun District, as members were concerned about the negative impact the proposal would have on the tourism industry, especially during the construction stage and possibly thereafter.
- Strengthen reference to the concerns raised by members regarding the impact of noise, particularly in relation to the negative impact of nighttime noise during the construction phase.

The Group Head of Planning advised members that officers would now formulate additional text to take into account the above amendments to the LIR requested by the Committee and would be re-circulated to the Committee for information before submission to the Secretary of State.

The Committee

RESOLVED to

- i. Provide comments on and agree the proposed Local Impact Report, set out in Appendix 1 to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.
- ii. Delegate authority to the Group Head of Planning to make appropriate amendments, to be re-circulated to the Committee for information before submission of the LIR.
- iii. To agree that written representations based on the contents of the Local Impact Report are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with the timescales confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate.

529. APPEALS LIST

Members noted the appeals list.

(The meeting concluded at 4.26 pm)