

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025 at 2.00 pm

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

Councillors O'Neill and Turner were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillors Lury and Patel.

439. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Declaration of Interest Sheet set out below confirms those Members who had made a declaration of their personal interest as a Member of a Town or Parish Councillor or a West Sussex County Councillor, as confirmed in their Register of Interest as these declarations could apply to any of the issues to be discussed at the meeting:

Name	Town or Parish Council or West Sussex County Council [WSSCC]
Councillor Billy Blanchard-Cooper	Littlehampton
Councillor June Hamilton	Pagham
Councillor Martin Lury	Bersted
Councillor Mike Northeast	Littlehampton
Councillor Peggy Partridge	Rustington
Councillor George O'Neill	Littlehampton
Councillor Sue Wallsgrove	Barnham and Eastergate
Councillor Bob Woodman	Littlehampton

Councillor Wallsgrove declared a Personal Interest in Item 6 [WA/74/24/OUT - LAND OFF ARUNDEL ROAD, FONTWELL] and explained that she would leave the chamber during the item's consideration.

Councillor Gunner declared a Non-Disclosable Personal Interest in Item 7 [LU/186/24/S73 - MEWSBROOK PARK TRADING KIOSK, HENDON AVENUE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN16 2LX] and explained that as he knew the applicant he would leave the chamber during the item's consideration.

Councillor Blanchard-Cooper declared a Personal Interest in Item 7 [LU/186/24/S73 - MEWSBROOK PARK TRADING KIOSK, HENDON AVENUE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN16 2LX] as a former employee and explained that he would leave the chamber during the item's consideration.

Planning Committee - 15.01.25

Councillor Warr declared a Personal Interest as member of Bognor Regis Town Council.

440. MINUTES

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 December 2024 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chair.

441. ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA WHICH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

There were no urgent items presented at the meeting.

The Chairman announced at this point that he would be bringing forward Item 9 [FG/92/24/PL - Land to the rear of 1 Sea Drive, Ferring, BN12 5HD], so it would be the first application considered by the committee at the meeting. The rest of the agenda would be then followed in its printed order as in the agenda.

442. FG/92/24/PL - LAND TO THE REAR OF 1 SEA DRIVE, FERRING, BN12 5HD

5 Public Speakers

Nadine Phibbs, Ferring Parish Council
Andrew Crabb, Objector
Stephen Abbott, Objector
Michael Austin, Agent
Kieran Rafferty, Supporter

1 No dwelling. This application is in CIL Zone 4 and is CIL Liable as a new dwelling.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report with updates to members.

After public speaking had been completed, the Chair invited the officer to make any comment on the points raised by the speakers where she clarified comments made regarding the applications Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), she explained that work had taken place since the application was originally submitted and a small section at the front of the property had now been secured to ensure the application now exceeded the BNG required.

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

The Chair invited members to make their comments and ask any questions they had of Officers, where road safety concerns were raised specifically, the cross over was considered inappropriate for a residential dwelling, comments were heard from some members who felt that the application was an overdevelopment of the site, considering the 'increase' in the site's footprint. It was asked if Officers had completed a site visit, this was confirmed by the Senior Planning Officer, it was then suggested that members complete a site visit to review the road safety concerns that had been raised. In response to this suggestion the Group Head of Planning asked members, what was it that they couldn't see from the report, presentation or the public realm currently, that would make a site visit appropriate. He also reminded members of previous advice he had given them regarding deferral of applications for site visits to take place. With this advice having been given, members asked to review pictures from the presentation again that showed where the 'cross over' was, the Officer confirmed that the cross over did have planning permission and would also require a licence to be given from West Sussex County Council (WSSCC). It was asked if there were other cross overs on the road, the Officer confirmed that there was a parking area in front of 108 Sea Drive and that there was an assumption that there were other cross overs within the road. Some members were in agreement that the pictures in the Officer presentation showed there was risk that would be faced by anyone reversing out from the site onto the road, however there was mixed support for the suggested proposal of a site visit for this purpose. Question then turned back to the footprint size of the development where it was queried if the footprint for the application did have an increase of 35% in comparison to previous applications. It was confirmed that the current scheme proposed 123sqm, the previous application proposed 124sqm and the application previous to that proposed 161sqm. Members agreed that they wanted more detailed information regarding the ground floor footprint size, Officers advised they would require time to obtain this information at which point the Chair proposed an adjournment to allow officers to provide this information which was duly seconded by Councillor Hamilton.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm and readjourned at 3:11pm.

The Chair welcomed everyone back to the meeting and invited the Senior Planning Officer to provide members with the footprint information requested. She confirmed that the calculations in the first application had a Ground Floor footprint of 89sqm, the second application 71sqm and the current application before members today was 90sqm, she confirmed that the First Floor accommodation was 'a lot less'.

The Chair asked members if they wanted to continue with the overdevelopment reasoning debate, where it was agreed to put the recommendation that had been proposed and seconded to the vote, upon the vote being taken:

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY.

Planning Committee - 15.01.25

443. WA/74/24/OUT - LAND OFF ARUNDEL ROAD, FONTWELL

(Councillor Wallsgrove redeclared her Personal Interest in Item 6 [WA/74/24/OUT - LAND OFF ARUNDEL ROAD, FONTWELL] and left the chamber during the item's consideration.)

1 Public Speakers

Jason Karagoz, Agent

Outline application with all matters reserved, other than access, for the erection of up to 56 No. residential dwellings including affordable housing and a stand-alone community building. This application may affect the setting of a listed building and may affect a public right of way.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report with updates to members including an update to the recommendation.

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

The Chair then invited members to make their comments and ask any questions of officers, where it was queried why a damaged 150-millimetre surface water sewer pipe would be left to see if it floods, if it was found to flood then it would be replaced with a 225-millimetre pipe, why can this work not be completed before hand. The Principal Planning Officer explained that the developer's intention was to drain via infiltration into the ground with a holding attenuation pond in the southeast corner of the site. If infiltration was not possible then a plan B option was requested by County Drainage and this would be the replacement of the 150-millimeter pipe with a 225-millimeter pipe, infiltration was the preferred option which was why replacement of the damaged pipe was not proposed to be completed in the first instance. Flooding concerns for the area were raised and reference was made to the conditions in the report where a request was made to apply Grampian conditions in order to alleviate flooding concerns The Officer explained as detailed in the update report that the comments now received from Southern Water confirmed that they had no objections in terms of capacity of the network and on that basis they only requested a standard condition and did not request any phasing of occupancy for the application.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the committee delegate to the Group Head of Planning in consultation with the Chair or Vice-Chair with authority to:

- A) Grant full planning permission subject to conditions including agreement of the required surface water drainage conditions; and

- B) Subject to a section 106 agreement, the terms of which are substantially in accordance with those set out in the report and report update with any minor amendments authorised by the Group Head of Planning.

444. LU/186/24/S73 - MEWSBROOK PARK TRADING KIOSK, HENDON AVENUE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN16 2LX

(Councillor Gunner redeclared his Non-Disclosable Personal Interest in Item 7 [LU/186/24/S73 - MEWSBROOK PARK TRADING KIOSK, HENDON AVENUE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN16 2LX] and confirmed he would leave the chamber during the consideration of the item.

Councillor Blanchard-Cooper redeclared his Personal Interest in Item 7 [LU/186/24/S73 - MEWSBROOK PARK TRADING KIOSK, HENDON AVENUE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN16 2LX] and confirmed he would leave the chamber during the consideration of the item.)

No Public Speakers

Variation of condition 2 and 7 imposed under LU/158/22/PL relating to approved plans and rewording of period for decentralised, renewable, low carbon energy supply system to a 12 month period and removal of condition 8 relating to full details of biodiversity (green/brown) roof.

The Team Leader (Development Management) presented the report to members. He updated members on the variation of condition 2 relating to the plans of the application and to remove condition 8 relating to biodiversity net gain in favour of alternative details and finally a variation to condition 7 by extending the timeline for the installation of solar panels.

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

Members were then invited to make comment and ask any questions they had for officers where it was queried if the reduction in solar panels would impact the potential output capacity, it was confirmed that officers were satisfied any output capacity would be minimal change if any as the solar panels being fitted whilst there were fewer were larger in size.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY.

Planning Committee - 15.01.25

445. LU/242/24/PL - 1-5 ST MARTINS LANE, LITTLEHAMPTON, BN17 6BS

2 Public Speakers

Khawar Shahzard, Applicant
Captain Anthony Joy, Littlehampton Muslim Trust

Change of use to F1 and F2 community centre and place of worship. This application is in CIL zone 4 (zero rated) as other development.

The Team Leader (Development Management) presented the report with updates to members.

After public speaking the Chair invited the Team Leader to respond to any points made where he addressed the building usage comments made by the applicant that confirmed the building would be used for 1 hour, 5 times a day for prayer, he confirmed for members that the applicant had also included in the application the building would be used for other activities within the centre which would suggest the building would be able to be used for more than the 5 hours a day for prayer. Regarding the Highway authority comments he confirmed the applicant had been asked to prove that their use of the building would not cause any harm, and this was not specifically related to the provided parking numbers.

The Group Head of Planning was invited to address members where he reminded them that the application was for a Place of Worship, the denomination, religion etc should not be taken into account when making your decision today as it is not a material consideration.

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

The Chair then invited members to make their comment and ask any questions of officers where comments of support for the application were heard, the reasons for support were stated as the applicant would result in good community use of the building and would bring needed community investment to the Town. The objection from Environmental Health was commented to not be understood, considering there was a public house almost next door to the application site and at the very least the operating hours should therefore match those of the public house. In discussing the comments regarding parking provision and concerns raised in the report, it was stated by one member he was not aware of a time where all the car parks in the area had been at full capacity, at the same time before. Another member highlighted that the applicant was and had been for 6 years using another site as a Place of Worship that was located only 150 meters away from this site, with no issues recorded and therefore that should provide everyone with the confirmation that there would be no parking issues. Throughout the debate it was clear that a majority of members agreed that the matters still outstanding required resolving and that deferring the application to allow for this work to be completed should be considered. Once debate had concluded and all

questions asked to the officer had been answered, the Chair put the recommendation to the vote where the recommendation FELL.

The Chair then requested for those who voted against the recommendation to put forward an alternative recommendation. The majority of Members were in agreement that deferment of the application was needed in order to receive and consider the outstanding consultation comments from WSCC and Environmental Health, with only one member commenting that he would be happy to have the application approved as it was. Deferment of the application was then formally proposed by Councillor Bower and seconded by Councillor Northeast.

The Chair then requested the recorded vote was undertaken, the result of that vote was as follows, those voting FOR (10) Councillors Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Hamilton, Kelly, McDougall, Northeast, Partridge, Wallsgrove, Warr and Woodman. Those voting AGAINST (1) Councillor Gunner.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be DEFERRED to allow for the outstanding consultation responses from WSCC and Environmental Health to be received and considered.

446. BR/232/24/HH - 11 CHICHESTER ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS, PO21 2XG

1 Public Speaker

David Hastings, Objector

Proposed loft conversion. Adjustments to the fenestration.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the report to members.

The officer recommendation was proposed by Councillor Partridge and seconded by Councillor Woodman.

As there were no comments or questions from committee members, the Chair went the vote.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY.

Planning Committee - 15.01.25

447. APPEALS LIST

Members noted the appeals list.

448. MODERNISING PLANNING COMMITTEES - PROPOSED NATIONAL SCHEME OF DELEGATION FOR PLANNING COMMITTEES

The Group Head of Planning presented the report to members, where he explained that the report was on a working paper received from central Government and confirmed that it was not a formal consultation at this point. He explained that the paper was reviewing the belief that Planning Committees could be a 'blocker or a slowing down of permissions' and was therefore proposing to make changes that could potentially remove a number of decisions to be made by committee. He stated that whilst this may be an issue for other authorities, he did not believe this was a problem faced by Arun District Council and therefore the responses drafted in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair reflected that.

The recommendation was then proposed by Councillor Wallsgrove and seconded by Councillor Blanchard-Cooper.

The Chair confirmed that whilst he was a member of the Labour Party, he and the Group Head of Planning were in complete agreement with their views on this working paper. He then invited members of the committee to make any comments where comments made echoed support for the response drafted, it was stated the responses detailed were truthful and represented Arun District Council appropriately. One member asked if the wording for question 2 could be more detailed to support the importance of the council being able to have a say on applications it wants to have a say on, the Group Head of Planning explained he understood the point raised, however the response had been deliberately drafted to not be specific due to the varying reasons and nuances that may need to be considered as to why an application could and should be brought before committee, therefore it could prove counterproductive if the response were to be more defined at this stage. Based on the reply from the Group Head of Planning the member agreed with his approach and asked if the wording could therefore be 'a bit tougher' before the response was sent. The Chair then confirmed with members that they were happy for this to be reviewed and actioned by the Group Head of Planning in consultation with him and the Vice-Chair

The Committee

RESOLVED that

it agreed the draft response at Appendix 1.

(The meeting concluded at 4.31 pm)

Subject to approval at the next Planning Committee meeting

379

Planning Committee - 15.01.25