DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

9 October 2019 at 2.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chair), B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Chapman (substituting for Councillor Mrs Stainton) Charles, Clayden (substituting for Councillor Mrs Pendleton), Coster, Edwards, Mrs Hamilton, Lury, Northeast, Roberts, Mrs Yeates and Mrs Worne.

Councillors Mrs Haywood and Huntley were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

241. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Mrs Pendleton and Mrs Stainton.

242. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Edwards Planning Application BE/69/19/OUT - I wish to make this meeting aware that I did make an objection to the previous application on this site. This was my view at that time and I have not made any comment on this latest application. I have an open mind regarding this item and I will listen, and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Councillor Coster AW/134/19/HH – I wish to make this meeting aware that I may have made public statements as part of my election campaign and or in other circumstances that I have concerns about this particular application. These were my views that I held at that time. However, I have an open mind regarding this item and I will listen and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Councillor Mrs Hamilton P/134/16/OUT – I wish to make this meeting aware that I may have made public statements as part of my election campaign that I have concerns about some of the proposed development in the Parish of Pagham. Those were views I held at the time, however, I have an open mind regarding such development, mostly on the question of flood risk, and I will listen and consider all the relevant issues, presented to the Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Mrs Yeates - Planning Application BE/69/19/OUT – I wish to make this meeting aware that I was involved with Bersted Parish Council's deliberations on the previous application on this site. I held views at that time on the previous application, however, I have not made any comment on the latest application. I have an open mind regarding

this item and I will listen, and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

Mrs Yeates – Planning Application BE/47/19/PL – I wish to make this meeting aware that I was involved with Bersted Parish Council's deliberations on the application on this site. I held views at that time on the application, however, I have not made any further comment and I understand it has been amended. I have an open mind regarding this item and I will listen and consider all the relevant issues and interests presented to this Committee today and I confirm that I will reach my decision on merit.

243. PERSONAL APOLOGY

Councillor Bower made a personal apology to the Chairman for a comment he had made at the last meeting, which had been made in the heat of the moment. The Chairman appreciated his apology.

244. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2019 were approved by the Committee and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

245. POST COMMITTTEE SITE INSPECTION 33 BALLIOL CLOSE, ALDWICK, PO21 5QE

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Coster had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

AW/134/19/HH – Single storey side and rear extension with habitable roofspace and conversion of existing roofspace to habitable use, together with porch removal and replacement windows, 33 Balliol Close, Aldwick

This application had been deferred from the meeting held on 4 September 2019 to enable it to be readvertised following receipt of amended plans. The officer report update circulated at the meeting summarised the responses received to the readvertisement and concluded that none of the points raised altered the officer recommendation to approve.

The Planning Team Leader reminded the Committee that the amended plans had reduced the size of the proposed extension and dormer. He also advised that, as the consultation date would end on 10 October 2019, the decision would need to be taken under delegated powers by the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

In discussing the matter, comment was made that the amendments made to the original proposal were welcomed and, whilst some Members expressed concerns, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update and the decision be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

246. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED APPLICATION Y/103/18/PL 10 ACRE FIELD, NORTH OF GREVATTS LANE, YAPTON

Previously deferred Application Y/103/18/PL – Single Chapel Crematorium with car parking, landscape works, surface water drainage features & associated highway improvements. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, 10 Acre Field, North of Grevatts Lane, Yapton

This application had been deferred from the meeting held on 7 August 2019 to enable an independent Road Safety Audit (RSA) to be undertaken, the results of which were outlined in the agenda item. An officer report update was also circulated at the meeting which detailed:

- the applicant's response to the RSA
- West Sussex County Council's confirmation that the access arrangements had been tracked for a hearse, fire tender, refuse vehicle and articulated HGV
- An additional representation from SUSTRANS
- Advice that the S106 legal agreement had not been signed/completed and any approval would need to be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and subject to completion of the S106 Agreement and the recommended conditions

In entering into debate on the matter, Members were still extremely concerned with regard to road safety issues, particularly the junction onto the A259, and were not convinced that the introduction of signage would be sufficient to prevent accidents along the A259 as a result of traffic slowing down to turn sharply into Grevatts Lane West to access the proposed crematorium. It was felt that there was a need for a deceleration lane.

The County Highways Officer in attendance confirmed that a deceleration lane had not been considered at any point; the visibility to be provided was in line with standards; and the signage suggested by the second RSA would be installed and dealt with at the detailed design stage.

The Group Head of Planning advised Members that the application had been in the system for a considerable time and that it would not be appropriate to have a further deferral for further consultation with County Council Members, as had been suggested in the course of discussion because, had they wished to, they could have made comments through that consultation period. He confirmed that the geometry of the junction was generous to enable vehicles to turn in and two RSAs had been undertaken to provide evidence that the highway issues would be addressed. If Members did not agree with the RSAs they needed to come forward with evidence to the contrary as it was not sufficient to just say they did not like what had been presented. In the absence

of such evidence, the advice from the Group Head of Planning was that a refusal of permission on those grounds would not be robust, was unlikely to be able to be defended and could potentially open the Council up to costs at a future appeal.

In turning to the vote, the Committee did not agree with the officer recommendation to approve and there was further discussion around a reason for refusal. The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. In the absence of a left turn deceleration lane and the potential for rear end shunts on the west bound A259, the proposals would result in severe harm to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists using the A259 in conflict with TSP1 of the Arun Local Plan and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the NPPF.

2. The proposed access from Grevatts Lane West, with the inclusion of a right turn going eastbound onto the A259, would be unsafe and would result in severe harm to pedestrians, cyclists and motorists using the A259 in conflict with TSP1 of the Arun Local Plan and paragraphs 108 - 110 of the NPPF.

247. PREVIOUSLY DEFERRED ITEM P/134/16/OUT LAND NORTH OF SEFTER ROAD & 80 ROSE GREEN ROAD, PAGHAM

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Huntley spoke as the Ward Member.

Councillor Mrs Hamilton had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

Determination of Planning Application P/134/16/OUT

The Committee received a comprehensive report from the Group Head of Planning which addressed the 3 reasons that had resulted in the application being deferred at the meeting held on 4 September 2019. Members were being requested to grant planning permission under delegated authority once the content of the report had been considered.

The Group Head of Planning gave a brief presentation which summarised the content of his report. It was highlighted that an amended planning condition had been accepted by the applicant with regard to the WW2 Infantry Section Post and that the details of a statement of how it would be retained on site and integrated as part of the proposals would be considered by the Committee at a future date.

Members welcomed the retention of the Infantry Section Post.

In the course of debate, a view was expressed that as a decision notice had not been issued against the application, it was permissible to consider new information relating to highways issues. West Sussex County Council had issued a document in April 2013 which stated that there were would be an inability to put forward a mitigation scheme to alleviate highways issues in Pagham and that should be considered as new information since the application had been approved in November 2018. In addition, there was felt to be a conflict with the policies in the Local Plan and therefore it should now refused. However, the Group Head of Planning reminded the Committee that the application had been considered in accordance with all the relevant policies and had been found to be acceptable and those policies had not changed since the decision in November 2018. With regard to the highways issues referred to by the Member, this was an interpretation of what had been published and it was reiterated that there was no new information, surveys or data to be considered, a fact that had already been confirmed by the County Council. In addition, the document being referred to was a consultation response on a different application.

Following further comments from Members, the Committee

RESOLVED

That delegated authority be granted to the Group Head of Planning for the completion of the Section 106 Agreement, substantially in accordance with the Heads of Terms previously approved by the Committee on 13 November 2018 and to grant planning; and to grant planning permission subject to the S106 Agreement and Conditions and Informatives, as set out in the report of 4 September 2019.

248. AW/28/19/PL REAR OF 276 ALDWICK ROAD, ALDWICK PO21 3QH

AW/28/19/PL – Erection of 1 No. dwelling & associated works, Rear of 276 Aldwick Road, Aldwick Having received a report on the matter, together with the officer's written report update detailing that the Section 106 Agreement to secure the Pagham Harbour contribution of £871 had been completed, which had resulted in a change to the recommendation to read "Approve conditionally with Section 106 Agreement", the Committee participated in some discussion on the merits of the proposal.

Some Members expressed reservations with regard to the application as it was felt it would have a negative impact on the special character of the area due to its close proximity to the duck pond. Concerns were also voiced in respect of the loss of trees and the loss of parking for the public visiting the duck pond but, following responses from the Principal Planning Officer, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved conditionally with Section 106 Agreement and as detailed in the officer report and officer report update.

249. A/62/19/PL OLD BLACKSMITH'S YARD, WATER LANE, ANGMERING BN16 4EP

A/62/19/PL – Erection of 2 No. semi-detached dwellings with associated access, car parking & landscaping. This application may affect the setting of a listed building, Old Blacksmith's Yard, Water Lane, Angmering Having received a report on the matter, a concern was raised with regard to the potential for flooding – the Planning Team Leader advised that the Council's Engineers had requested conditions which would address the issue of surface water drainage to prevent any adverse impact from the development itself. The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and that delegated authority be granted to the Group Head of Planning to issue the decision following expiry of the advertising period on 10 October 2019.

250. BE/47/19/PL 38 CHALCRAFT LANE, BERSTED PO21 5TX

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Mrs Yeates had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

BE/47/19/PL – Addition of first floor to existing bungalow to allow conversion to 2 x 1 bedroom flats and a studio flat, 38 Chalcraft Lane, Bersted Having received a report on the matter, the Committee voiced concerns that this was a cramped form of overdevelopment that was out of character with the street scene. The parking provision of 4 spaces was also of concern as Members were not persuaded that there was sufficient space for that number of vehicles. The Committee therefore did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposed development represents a cramped overdevelopment of the site with unsuitable parking causing harm to the character of the area contrary to Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

251. BE/69/19/OUT THE COTTAGE, SHRIPNEY ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS PO22 9PA

(Prior to consideration of this application, Councillor Edwards and Mrs Yeates had declared a personal interest and remained in the meeting and took part in the debate and vote.)

BE/69/19/OUT – Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for up to 31 No. houses and flats with car parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure & access off Shripney Road (A29), all following the demolition of the existing dwelling & outbuildings. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, The Cottage, Shripney Road, Bognor Regis Having received a report on the matter, the Committee also received the officer's written report update, which was circulated that the meeting, detailing:-

- Change to the description to state "up to 31 dwellings", which would provide the Local Planning Authority with greater flexibility in the future when a reserved matters application was submitted.
- The red edge of the application had been amended and conditions 1 and 8 had been amended accordingly.
- A new condition 21 had been added to secure the proposed pedestrian footways on Shripney Road.
- As the S106 Agreement had not yet been signed, delegated authority was sought for the Group Head of Planning to approve planning permission once the legal agreement had been signed, should Members recommend approval.

In opening up the debate, comment was made that a previous approval for 20 houses and flats was acceptable but that an increase to 31 was not as this part of Shripney Road would not be included in the A29 realignment, so there would still be substantial traffic movements along this stretch of road, which would create problems for access and egress to and from the site.

The Group Head of Planning reminded the Committee that this was an outline application and the illustrated plans were indicative only – the figure was for up to 31 dwellings and Members were not being asked to approve the final number at this stage. However, following further discussion, Members were still concerned with regard to the proposal and did not accept the officer recommendation to approve..

The Chairman called a 10 minute adjournment to enable officers to formulate a reason for refusal based on Members' comments.

On the meeting being reconvened, the Group Head of Planning provided advice to Members that they needed to take account of as to whether the additional impact of up to 31 houses would result in overdevelopment. Further Member comment was made around the lack of amenity space; the fact that flats were now being included; and the density of parking spaces.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:

As a result of the number of units proposed, the development would result in an overdevelopment of the site by virtue of lack of amenity space, inappropriate density and insufficient car parking contrary to policies D SP1, D DM1 and T SP1 of the Arun Local Plan, policy HDQ8 of the Bersted Neighbourhood Plan and policies within the NPPF.

252. BR/129/19/PL 75 HIGHFIELD ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS PO22 8PD

BR/129/19/PL – Conversion of single dwelling to 4 No. flats including rear projection and 1 parking space (resubmission of BR/215/18/PL), 75 Highfield Road, Bognor Regis Having received a report on the matter, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

253. EP/179/18/PL GLADWYN, THE STREET, EAST PRESTON BN16 1HTR

EP/179/18/PL – Demolition of existing house & erection of 3 x 3 bedroom houses together with landscaping, car parking and fencing, Gladwyn, The Street, East Preston Having received a report on the matter, the Committee also received an officer report update which was circulated at the meeting and detailed the following:-

- The proposal had been the subject of a Pre Site Inspection Panel visit
- A Parish Council representation regarding the height of the building and the roof pitch and resultant Condition 9 restricting Permitted Development with regard to the creation of dormers.
- An amended block plan had been received, as detailed in the update.
- Correction to the description of the application, as detailed in the update.
- Consultation response from County Highways of no objection, subject to the imposition of a condition.
- Visibility splays and relevant condition.
- Car parking spaces
- Consultee comment from East Preston Parish Council objecting due to the lack of practical on-street parking close to the development.
- Officer comment.

The Panning Team Leader was able to confirm that parking provision at the site had been increased from 4 to 7; the roof height had been reduced; and that the use of dormers would be controlled by Condition 9.

In discussing the proposal, it was acknowledged that this site was in need of development. However, the provision of three houses and resultant traffic movements to and from the site would cause unacceptable disruption, with visitors having to park on the road away from the site.

The Chairman of the Pre Committee Site Inspection Panel advised that the visit to the site had been informative for those Members in attendance as it highlighted the highways issues in the locality. The adjoining roads were narrow and, as they formed part of the bus route, problems were experienced with the on street parking already taking place, which would inevitably be exacerbated by this proposal. A further cause for concern was the fact that the visibility splays would need to be widened, which would cause the loss of the flint wall to the front of the property – it was felt that this would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The Planning Team Leader reiterated that the 7 parking spaces designed into the scheme were in line with the County Council's parking calculator.

In turning to the vote, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve. The options to refuse or defer were then considered, following which it was formally proposed and duly seconded that the application be deferred to enable officers to seek assurance from County Highways that they had included in their assessment of this proposal the planning permission on the adjoining site due to the serious concerns expressed with regard to road safety in the area and what the cumulative effect of the two adjoining developments would have on the road network. It was also agreed that the applicant would be asked to ascertain what visibility could be achieved if the flint wall was retained and whether County Highways would find that acceptable. It was further agreed to ask County Highways to visit the site and attend the Planning Briefing Panel to listen to the concerns of Members.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred to enable County Highways to provide further information with regard to its assessment of the two adjoining developments on the road network and to ascertain whether the flint wall could be retained.

254. FG/74/19/PL HIGHDOWN INDUSTRIAL PARK, LITTLEHAMPTON ROAD, FERRING BN12 6PG

FG/74/19/PL – 2 No. commercial B1/B8 use buildings with associated car parking, access & refuse storage. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, Highdown Industrial Park, Littlehampton Road, Ferring Having received a report on the matter, together with the officer's written report update which detailed an additional condition requiring precise details of the materials to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration and a consultation response from

County Highways of no objection, the Committee participated in some discussion on the proposal.

In opening up the debate, Member comment was made that the designated gap between Angmering and Worthing must be protected and that the encroachment over the years into this particular area must be stopped in order to protect the views from Highdown Hill.

It was acknowledged that the site had existing industrial uses and that it would be difficult to refuse a proposal that would be improving what was already there into a better form.

However, when voting on the matter, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and therefore

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposed development would compromise the open nature of the gap between settlements contrary to policy SD SP3 of the Arun Local Plan and, due to the proximity to the South downs National Park, the proposal would also have a detrimental effect on the setting of Highdown Hill and be contrary to policy LAN DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

255. K/19/19/HH LITTLETANGLEY, MIDDLEWAY, KINGSTON GORSE, EAST PRESTON BN16 1SB

K/19/19/HH – Two storey rear extension with a small canopy projecting the footprint to the front. Demolition of existing living room and additional first floor for habitable use with alterations to fenestration, Little Tangley, Middle Way, Kingston Gorse, East Preston Having received a report on the matter, Members expressed concern that the extension was certainly not subservient to the host building and was in conflict with the policies in the Local Plan.

The Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and the Group Head of Planning provided advice on reasons for refusal as he was of the view that the height and size of the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact and there were no issues around residential amenity.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposal by virtue of its height, scale and site coverage will have an unneighbourly impact on neighbouring residential occupiers in conflict with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and policy KPNP7 of the Kingston Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

256. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the appeals that had been received.

(The meeting concluded at 7.06 pm)