

PLANNING COMMITTEE

13 December 2023 at 2.00 pm

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

Councillors were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillors

460. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Bower and Woodman.

461. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bicknell declared a personal interest in Item 10 [A/39/23/PL LAND WEST OF BROOK LAND AND SOUTH OF A259, ANGMERING, BN16 3JL] as a resident of Angmering.

Councillor Long declared a personal interest in Item 10 [A/39/23/PL LAND WEST OF BROOK LAND AND SOUTH OF A259, ANGMERING, BN16 3JL] as a member of Littlehampton Town Council and its Planning and Transportation Committee who had previously considered this application. She then stated that she would be keeping an open mind when considering this application.

462. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 November 2023 were approved and signed by the Chair.

463. 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 for this meeting.

Planning Committee - 13.12.23

464. CM/48/21/RES - LAND TO THE WEST OF CHURCH LANE AND SOUTH OF HORSEMERE GREEN LANE, CLIMPING

No Public Speakers.

Approval of reserved matters following the grant of CM/1/17/OUT for the erection of 300 No dwellings & a building within use class E, together with public open space, LAPs, LEAP & ancillary works, including car parking & drainage arrangements, with access off Church Lane & Horsemere Green Lane. This application may affect the setting of listed buildings & is in CIL Zone 4 (HSP2) & is not CIL Liable.

The Strategic Development Team Leader presented the report with updates.

Members raised the following points during debate, concern regarding ensuring delivery of the Fitness Trail, were there commuted sums within the S106 agreement set aside for the inside of the Community Centre building and drainage concerns.

Officers provided answers and advice to all points raised during the debate and the recommendation was then proposed by Councillor McDougall and seconded by Councillor Bicknell.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY.

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

4 Public Speakers

Councillor Peter Atkins, Pagham Parish Council
James Weston, Objector
Jon Gateley, Agent
Councillor David Huntley, Ward Member

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 with updates that detailed a number of minor changes that had been made to the layout and landscaping details in accordance with comments received by West Sussex County Highways.

After public speakers had been heard the Principal Planning Officer was invited by the Chair to address any comments made by those who had spoken, where it was confirmed that drainage controls and mitigations were still needed to be known at this stage. The Strategic Development Team Leader confirmed that the design of the main spine road had been agreed as acceptable access for the Primary School and in addressing the comments made in relation to animals being able to go through the dry SUDS features and out onto the agricultural fields to disturb the Brent Geese habitat the officer confirmed that these had been discussed in detail, however this matter was not material to the consideration of a reserved matters application.

Members raised the following points during debate, the application was stated not to be in keeping with the Pagham Design statement, the location of the site was in flood zone one, concerns regarding the height of the development so as not to dwarf the Church and the views that were currently available. It was noted that the developers had made some changes however, they were not deemed to be enough. Flooding concerns were discussed in detail where it was confirmed that the council's drainage engineers would require additional information at the next stage (through a discharge of condition application), however at the outline stage of the application the details they had were deemed satisfactory. It was also confirmed that the developers would require a drainage design to be approved before any building commenced for the development. In addressing the concern that no mitigation land had been provided it was stated that this had been identified through the S106 agreement, however the developer would need to submit evidence in order to address the matter. It was also acknowledged that that whilst the Brent Geese mitigation site chosen did flood, it was the developer's responsibility to address and resolve these concerns ahead of commencing. Officers confirmed that they would require evidence showing the site could be sufficiently drained and that reassurance and a deliverability plan needed to be provided to ensure it met the requirements.

The discussion then returned to the concerns raised regarding the height of the buildings where it was asked if officers could confirm they had been reduced as had been requested during the consultation stages and by how much they had been reduced. It was confirmed that this information would need to be provided outside of the meeting given the number of individual house types and variations in height, however specifically relating to the listed buildings to the south of the development the outline permissions were assessed that that the harm identified was less than substantial. The Principal Planning Officer explained that this application dealt with the specific harm identified and ensures that any harm established was then dealt with at outline stage. It was confirmed that for this application the harm established had not exceeded the initial assessment. Members continued to debate this matter before putting the officer recommendation to the vote.

Planning Committee - 13.12.23

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Wallsgrove and seconded by Councillor Northeast, upon the vote being taken the recommendation was not approved.

Members then turned to discussing reasons for refusal specifically relating to not knowing the specific height of the buildings within the development. Councillor Lury then proposed that the application be DEFERRED until the impact of the height of the buildings could be confirmed. This was seconded by Councillor McDougal.

As members continued their debate on the deferral reason, it was also suggested that additional reasons for deferral be added to the proposal, these were drainage concerns and the lack of additional infrastructure in place to prevent future flooding and further mitigations needed in relation to the Brent Geese. The Group Head of Planning provided strong advice to members that these were already addressed by planning conditions imposed on the outline and therefore were not required to be specifically outlined in their deferral reasoning.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be DEFERRED until the clarification of the impact of the height of the buildings on the St Thomas a Becket Church could be understood.

Those voting FOR were Councillors Blanchard-Cooper, Hamilton, Long, Lury, McDougall, Northeast and Wallsgrove. No Councillors voted AGAINST. Those voting to ABSTAIN were Councillors Bicknell, Kelly, Partridge and Patel.

Due to the decision to defer this application it was suggested by the Group Head of Planning that a short adjournment was taken to allow officers to speak with the applicant as the next application was inextricably linked to this application. Members agreed and the meeting was adjourned at 15:20.

466. P/139/22/RES - CHURCH BARTON HOUSE, HORNS LANE, PAGHAM, PO21 4NZ

(The meeting readjourned at 15:31.)

Public Speaking on this item was deferred.

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 Group Head of Planning confirmed that officers would now be recommending that the application be deferred due to its linkage to the last application. He advised and recommended that Members still may want to make comments on the application in order to assist officers in resolving these concerns when both applications are brought back to another meeting of the Committee.

The Chair then confirmed with Officers and the Public Speakers in attendance at the meeting that public speaking on this item would be deferred until the application is brought back to the committee. The Principal Planning Officer provided members with a shortened presentation and Members were then invited to make any comments that they would like officers to consider before the application returned.

Upon a short discussion it was agreed that the height of the development was the main concern for the committee.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Wallsgrove and seconded by Councillor Lury. The Committee unanimously then voted to;

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be DEFERRED.

467. AL/102/23/PL - LAND NORTH OF NORTHFIELD FARMHOUSE, FONTWELL AVENUE, EASTERGATE

1 Public Speaker

Sarah Hocking, Agent

Development of 3 dwellings with associated landscaping and infrastructure. This application is a Departure from the Development plan, is in CIL Zone 3 and CIL Liable as new dwellings, and a dual parish application with Barnham & Eastergate Parish Council.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report with updates.

Members raised the following points during a short debate, given the outline approval for the site next door to this application it was commented that a reason for refusal could not be considered. The Vice-Chair asked officers for clarification regarding the access to the site and was the access road a private road where it was confirmed it was unknown if the road was private, however there was a right to pass.

The recommendation was proposed by Councillor Lury and seconded by Councillor Bicknell.

Planning Committee - 13.12.23

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY.

468. A/39/23/PL - LAND WEST OF BROOK LANE AND SOUTH OF A259, ANGMERING, BN16 3JL

(Councillors Bicknell and Long redeclared their personal interests in the item.)

2 Public Speakers

Simon Ulrich, Objector
Charlie Merry, Agent

Demolition of existing structures on site and the erection of an employment park for Use Class E(g)(ii) and B8 floorspace with ancillary offices and structures, delivering the enabling works phase, public right of way diversion, associated access, reptile re-location, drainage and landscaping scheme, followed by the delivery of each development parcel via severable phases. This application is in CIL Zone 4 (zero rated) as other development.

The Strategic Development Team Leader presented the report with updates and confirmed that the recommendation was now requesting delegated authority to approve the application subject to no objection being received from the Council's Drainage Engineers. He confirmed that should any comments require additional conditions these would be added, and this would be done in consultation with the Chair or Vice-Chair.

During the debate initial comments of support for the application were expressed. The Chair then invited non-committee member Councillor Gunner to address the committee where he raised concerns regarding the pedestrian crossing, he stated that he was not in agreement with the figure of 5 that had been documented, he believed that it only accounted for assumed employee movement. He also made reference to the lost appeal regarding Rusting Golf Course and one of the reasons was due to the crossing. The Strategic Development Team Leader advised that all work had been completed by the developer in consultation with Network Rail and the Council had no reason to dispute the information provided. In response to a query raised regarding the dual carriage way speed limit he confirmed that comments had been received from West Sussex County Council Highways where it was stated there was no objection and the design was considered to be acceptable. It was then asked if the Group Head of Planning would provide members with any additional advice, where it was confirmed, his advice was documented within the report.

Subject to approval at the next Planning Committee meeting

355

Planning Committee - 13.12.23

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

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application that delegated authority be given to approve the application subject to no objection being received from the Council's Drainage Engineers.

(The meeting concluded at 4.17 pm)