

Public Document Pack

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

461

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

28 April 2021 at 1.30 pm

Present: Councillors Bennett (Chair), Thurston (Vice-Chair), Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Charles, Coster, Edwards, Hamilton, Kelly, Lury, Pendleton, Roberts, Tilbrook, Warr and Yeates

[Note: The following Councillors were absent from the meeting during consideration of the matters detailed in the Minutes indicated – Councillor Tilbrook – Minute 520 (Part)].

Chair's Announcement

Before the Chair commenced the meeting, he reminded Members that the politically restricted pre-election period for the May 2021 elections had now commenced and that this had two consequences. Firstly, the Council could not carry out publicity or events which were designed to show support for a political party. The Chair therefore asked Members to be careful to address the issues and not use the meeting as a platform for political purposes. He warned that anyone who infringed the rule would not be allowed to speak further in the meeting. Secondly, this meant that any person who used this meeting for political publicity took the risk that the cost of this meeting would be counted towards their election expenses or of the candidate they were supporting.

540. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Coster declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 8 [LU/50/21/PL] as Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development. He confirmed he would not take part in the vote and would only speak to correct misunderstandings.

Councillor Tilbrook declared a Prejudicial Interest in Agenda Item 8 [LU/50/21/PL] as the site under discussion was observable from his home. He confirmed he would be removed from the meeting for the duration of the item and vote.

Councillor Blanchard-Cooper declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 8 [LU/50/21/PL] as a family member owned a beach hut on the site being discussed.

541. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 31 March 2021 were approved by the Committee.

542. BN/17/21/PL - THE COTTAGE, HIGHGROUND LANE, BARNHAM PO22 0BT

1 No. new dwelling. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan & is in CIL Zone 3 & is CIL Liable as new dwelling.

The Planning Team Leader presented his report with updates.

Development Control Committee - 28.04.21

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including the retention of a substantial tree on the site, protection of the tree in the approval conditions during construction but not subsequently and whether a Tree Preservation Order was something that should be pursued, the loss of light to the proposed development from the tree, the conditions and whether there should be any placed on removed and then replaced landscaping, concerns around the narrowness of entrances and whether there was sufficient parking on the site for the existing and proposed development.

The Planning Team Leader and Group Head of Planning provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

543. K/6/21/PL - 68 GOLDEN AVENUE, EAST PRESTON BN16 1QU

1 Public Speaker

Cllr Roger Wetherall, Kingston Parish Council

Variation of conditions 2 and 3 imposed under K/9/20/HH to change materials and finishes from those approved.

The Principal Planning Officer presented her report with updates. This was followed by a Public Speaker.

Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised including the issue of the dark grey colour proposed and Members' personal misgivings about it, the colour in relation to both the parish council's design guide and neighbourhood plan, the colour's appropriateness for a domestic dwelling and how in-keeping it was with neighbouring properties, that the proposed change was from a lighter to darker grey, the reality that there was much variation in style and colour across the housing of the immediate area, disappointment at the deviation from previously approved conditions and whether colour was even a planning consideration as it could be changed in the future unless permission was granted with restricted permitted development rights

The Principal Planning Officer and Group Head of Planning provided members with answers to all points raised during the debate.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be APPROVED CONDITIONALLY as detailed in the report and report update subject to the conditions outlined.

544. LU/50/21/PL - LITTLEHAMPTON PROMENADE, SOUTH OF PUTTING GREEN, SEA ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON

(Councillors Coster and Blanchard-Cooper redeclared their Personal Interests made at the start of the meeting. Councillor Tilbrook redeclared his Prejudicial Interest and was removed from the meeting for the duration of the item.)

The Principal Planning Officer presented her report with updates. Members then took part in a full debate on the application where a number of points were raised.

The principal concern among Members was the location of the proposed additional beach huts, particularly those at the bottom of Norfolk Road, and whether the additional huts would block the current gaps between the existing huts too much. It was raised that the huts would be less attractive to tourists than the sea views they would potentially be limiting and the infrequency of their use would be denying more people a visual aspect of the beach. The Cabinet Member for Commercial and Business Development confirmed that other locations had been looked at and had been ruled out.

Concerns were also raised about accessibility for wheelchair users and others for whom entry to the huts via the shingle beach would create difficulties and whether slight differences in colour between the old and new huts would have a detrimental impact on the view.

Though Members appreciated the commercial and economic benefits of having more beach huts and acknowledged that there was demand for more huts to be available, these were not considerations for this committee which was solely purposed to find on material planning considerations. Members spoke of their disappointment with the process of this planning application, whether it was being treated differently because it was a Council application, the need for more information to inform final decisions and whether the principles of the application should have been dealt with in committee before coming to the Development Control Committee.

The Principal Planning Officer and Group Head of Planning provided members with responses to all points raised during the debate.

Councillor Bower put forward a proposal for deferral until the application had been considered by the appropriate service committee for the developer side of matters, which was seconded by Councillor Pendleton. This was subsequently withdrawn and discussion moved to refusal of the application upon which the original recommendation was put to the vote and LOST and therefore,

Development Control Committee - 28.04.21

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be REFUSED given the number and position of the proposed beach huts and the lack of accessibility detail, the development would adversely affect the visual amenities of the locality in conflict with policies D DM1, DSP1 and LAN DM1 of the Arun Local Plan and policy SCP-1 of the South Inshore and Offshore Marine Plan.

545. APPEALS

The Committee received and noted the appeals list within the agenda. One Member asked how long on average the appeals process took and this was responded to by the Group Head of Planning who confirmed that, depending on the complexities of the application, this could be upwards on two to three months.

(The meeting concluded at 3.06 pm)