

Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

275

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

25 November 2020 at 2.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chairman), Ms Thurston (Vice-Chair), B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Clayden (Reserve) (Substitute for Edwards), Charles, Coster, Mrs Hamilton, Kelly, Lury, Mrs Pendleton, Roberts, Tilbrook, Mrs Warr and Mrs Yeates

Councillors Huntley (observing) was also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

Apologies: Councillor Edwards

320. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Planning Application WA/48/19/RES - Councillor Ms Thurston declared a prejudicial interest on the basis of predetermination as she had previously made statements in relation to this application.

321. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Development Control Meeting that was held on the 28 October 2020 were approved by the Committee and agreement was sought to sign the minutes as soon as practicably possible.

322. WA/48/19/RES - LAND TO THE EAST OF FONTWELL AVENUE, FONTWELL AVENUE, FONTWELL

(Prior to the consideration of this application, Councillor Ms Thurston had declared a prejudicial interest and was placed in the virtual waiting room and so took no part in the debate or vote.)

WA/48/19/RES - Approval for Reserved Matters following outline permission WA/22/15/OUT comprising 400 new homes (incl. affordable), 360sqm of retail space (A1 to A3), 152sqm of community space (D1 to D2 & including retention & refurbishment of 12sqm 'old smithy'), demolition of remaining buildings to Arundel Road along with public open space, LEAP, MUGA, allotments, car & cycle parking, drainage & associated works - This site also lies within the parish of Barnham & Eastergate.

At its meeting on Wednesday 24 June 2020 the committee was presented with this application and it was resolved to DEFER a decision to enable more work to be undertaken by the applicant on the design of the scheme. Following discussions with officers, the applicants submitted a large number of revised plans, drawings and documents. The application was then subject to a further period of consultation and publicity, which ended on 8 October 2020.

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report update to the committee and advised Members that the revised plans were prepared in the context of a new design

Development Control Committee - 25.11.20

code that increased the number of character areas from 5 to 6. Each area now adopted a more distinctive design approach.

In the course of discussion, overall support for the proposals was clear. Some reservations were expressed with regard to the phasing of the development and the need for the public sewer network to be improved by Southern Water. It was explained that whilst the Council did not have the exact details of the required network reinforcement at the current time, it would be something that the Council would expect to be completed by Southern Water over a two-year timeframe.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Director of Place or Group Head of Planning to approve the application subject to conditions as detailed in the report update following the expiry of 21 days from 18 November or a date that both Parish Councils have confirmed whether they propose to make any representations to the District Council, whichever is the sooner.

323. AL/64/20/PL - SPRINGFIELD, HOOK LANE, ALDINGBOURNE, PO20 3TE

(Councillor Ms Thurston was readmitted to the meeting prior to the presentation for this item)

Two Public Speakers

Mr John Gridley – Objector
Ms Kerry Simmonds – Agent

AL/64/20/PL - Land at Springfield, Hook Lane, Aldingbourne, demolition of the existing dwelling & construction of 2 no. 2-bed, 3 no. 3-bed, 4 no. 4-bed houses including access, landscaping & associated works. Resubmission following AL/51/19/PL & AL/27/20/PL

The Planning Officer presented the application and the report update to Members. He advised that the previous applications had been REFUSED on the basis of the trees in situ. The report update confirmed that the application now supplied the Tree schedule which had been omitted from the original report in the agenda. He further advised that there were a couple of minor conflicts with two policies, highlighting that there was no drainage impact assessment or no archaeological desk-based assessment but that these were outweighed by the benefit that would be made to the housing supply shortfall.

During the course of the debate Members stated that the application was much improved, they did voice their concern regarding the application in specific reference to road and traffic concerns for the site, however there was no legitimate planning reason for refusal.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved subject to conditions as detailed in the agenda.

324. BN/50/20/PL - LAND WEST OF FONTWELL AVENUE, FONTWELL AVENUE, FONTWELL PO20 3RX

Two Public Speakers

Mr Andrew Munton – Applicant

Ms Maddi Simpson – Agent

BN/50/20/PL - Land West of Fontwell Avenue demolition of existing structures on-site & erection of 42 No. dwellings with access, parking, landscaping & associated works. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan.

The Planning Officer presented the application for 42 new dwellings and the report update to Members. From the presentation it was highlighted that there would be some loss of trees and hedging to ensure good visibility for the new entrance access point. He advised that the application was contrary to the development plan policies, however it is believed that it is sustainably located and would assist greatly with the housing land supply shortage. He went on to advise Members that the drainage concerns had been resolved and were now acceptable to both Portsmouth Water and Environment Agency. Drawing Members attention to the update report that had been circulated prior to the meeting that highlights an error in the s106 on page 105 and proposes changes to conditions 2 and 31 as well as providing analysis of the impact of the emerging Barnham and Eastergate neighbourhood plan policies.

Throughout the debate Members were generally pleased to see an application with good green credentials, that had been well planned and thought through. Concerns were raised that the application was in conflict with the Barnham and Eastergate neighbourhood plan. The Planning Officer explained that there was a conflict with policy EE8, which supports retention of Equestrian businesses and conflict with the built up area boundary policy however the emerging neighbourhood plan also allocates this sites for residential development which he believed outweighed the two conflicts highlighted.

Development Control Committee - 25.11.20

The Committee

RESOLVED

That authority be delegated to the Director of Place to approve the application subject to conditions, as detailed in the report update, once the s106 has been completed

325. APPEALS

The Committee received a verbal update on three appeals from the Director of Place and then noted the remainder of the report.

326. BARNHAM EASTERGATE WESTERGATE (BEW) - SUBMISSION OF MASTERPLAN & FRAMEWORK FOR ENDORSEMENT

(Prior to the consideration of this application, Councillor Mrs Yeates had declared a prejudicial interest and was placed in the virtual waiting room and so took no part in the debate or vote.)

The Chairman reminded members that this was a high level framework masterplan for a site that is allocated within the Local Plan, the purpose of the master plan is to provide a vision and broad design principals for the site rather than details of how the infrastructure will be delivered it is not an opportunity to revisit the principals of the BEW allocation or the route of the A29 realignment. The recommendation included the submission of a phasing and delivery plan. Discussion should remain around the overarching principals set out in the framework masterplan.

The Senior Planning Officer advised Members that the masterplan would see a development of 4,300 homes whilst this was an increase the report did make clear previously that the originally reported 3000 homes was a minimum number. He gave a clear update on where the development was at in its process. He confirmed that the site would deliver a number of community facilities from nurseries to two schools, he confirmed that a mix of housing densities would be required across the site. The Northern portion of the A29 would be delivered by West Sussex County Council. The southern portion would be the first part of the substantive application for the site delivered. Due to the area around the Lidsey Rife being at higher risk of flooding, housing had been directed away from this area and drainage of the site works on the basis of a series of attenuation basins which would store water and result in a controlled discharge. Linear Park area had been planned to provide not only a defined feature for the site but also hydrological and ecological benefits to the district. Officers are satisfied that the framework masterplan would provide a flexibility for all eventualities and would allow a robust package towards infrastructure to be secured. In summary he stated that the framework masterplan had come from extensive discussions with developers and officers. Developers had made appropriate concessions throughout the process to

ensure alignment with the adopted Local Plan. It also established the principals against which planning applications would be submitted and when.

Members were complimentary to the “high quality” framework and had agreement that it would deliver the objective of the Local Plan. Concern was highlighted on the following;

- Traffic build up during the build
- Public Transport improvement needed
- Increase in number of homes
- Area for Bat habitat
- Clarity for the development of a footpath along the canal into the current bridleway

The Senior Planning Officer addressed some of the concerns discussed and advised Members that one of the reasons for phasing of the development was to ensure good management of the number of houses built but was a matter to be determined at a later time. In terms of biodiversity throughout the lifetime of the development the environmental bill would come into effect and as part of that it would net gains would be achieved, the aim was for at least 10% but the indicative surveys suggest that, that will be exceeded. He also confirmed the footpath that was raised was located at Chichester Canal and while he couldn't discuss in too much detail at this time as a future application would be submitted in relation to this, he confirmed more detail would be provided to Members at a later time.

The Committee

RESOLVED

that the ‘Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate Framework Masterplan Version for Endorsement November 2020’ be endorsed subject to the submission of a satisfactory Phasing and Delivery Plan being submitted to Officers for consideration and to be appended to the endorsed Framework Masterplan.

327. OPTIONS FOR INTRODUCING FURTHER CONTROLS ON THE DEFINITION, NUMBER AND QUALITY OF HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION

The Director of Place provided members with an update on the report and explained that the restrictions were two-fold and split by the Licensing and Planning restrictions. He advised that the Housing & Customer Services Working Group had completed their review of the licensing restrictions and that what was being suggested to the Committee was that they should utilise the same research that was being undertaken by the Licensing team.

Development Control Committee - 25.11.20

Early in the debate the cost of the research was queried to ensure that value for money was achieved given that the report suggested the problem was a fairly small one. It was explained that the cost associated with the researched would be difficult to establish prior to the research being completed, the Planning Service and Private Sector had utilised as much information they could up to this point. The report sets out £30,000 and it was confirmed that costs were not currently expected to be more than that, however this could change. Members were reminded at this point that it was the view of Full Council that matters needed to be investigated further with decisions to be presented at Full Council in January 2021 for further discussion.

Concern was also raised in relation to the time that Officers would be able to commit to the work that needed to be done in light of ongoing workload. It was confirmed that whilst the focus currently was on reviewing the Local Plan that would present a challenge, however that was also a good reason to consider a Consultant to help complete the research. If further requests come forward, then the priority would be to complete core business.

It was also raised that the report was asking to look at Bognor Regis only and to keep Littlehampton under review and would it not be more cost effective to review both areas at the same time. It was confirmed that currently the data that had been reviewed had suggested that the work is likely to be centred around the Bognor Regis area. However, if further research showed that Littlehampton was also needed then this would be done.

Concerns regarding people being housed in clusters had demonstrated problems in specific areas and would the research completed be a further opportunity to address these issues that were ongoing. If the research was undertaken it was explained that it would be able to provide additional information that would help with this concern moving forward.

The Committee

RECOMMEND TO FULL COUNCIL that;

The Council undertake further research with Housing Services in order to establish evidence to determine the justification and role for designating Article 4 Direction(s) in Bognor Regis as a priority and to keep the matter under review for Littlehampton, unless the work also confirms that there is sufficient justification to bring a further Article 4 Direction(s) forward at the same time.

(The meeting concluded at 4.32 pm)