



## How to contact us

Write to: Manor House, Church Street,  
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5EW

Email: [lrc@littlehampton-tc.gov.uk](mailto:lrc@littlehampton-tc.gov.uk)

Call: 01903 732063

Find us online: [www.littlehampton-tc.gov.uk](http://www.littlehampton-tc.gov.uk)

### **Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held on Monday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2021 at 6.30pm**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Long (Chair)  
Councillor Tandy  
Councillor Tilbrook  
Councillor Turner  
Councillor Woodman

#### **2021/2022**

**This meeting is available to view using the following link:**

<https://youtu.be/aS2CPd-Yhoo>

#### **21. Virtual Meeting Protocol and Use of Mobile Devices**

The Chairman opened the meeting and explained how it would be conducted and the protocol that would be followed, including how any break in the proceedings due to technical difficulties would be managed.

#### **22. Apologies**

There were apologies from Councillor Buckland who was delayed and if possible, would join the meeting later.

#### **23. Declarations of Interest**

Members and Officers were reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary or personal and/or prejudicial interests that they might have in relation to items on the agenda. The standing declarations were noted, and Councillor Tilbrook declared a personal interest in agenda item 8.2, Planning Applications, as a Member of Arun District Council's Planning Committee. He confirmed that when considering the planning applications for Littlehampton, he would do so without predetermination, taking into account the papers that were before him at that meeting.

## 24. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021 (previously circulated) were confirmed as a true record and it was noted that arrangements would be made for these to be signed at a later date.

## 25. Chair's Report and Urgent Items

### 25.1. Draft West Sussex Transport Plan 2022-2036

The Town Council had been notified that the County Council had commenced a consultation on the Draft West Sussex Transport Plan on 16<sup>th</sup> July with a closing date of 8<sup>th</sup> October 2021. The Plan set out the County Council's approach to managing and investing in the transport network. In terms of reviewing and commenting upon the content of the Plan, it was proposed that the Advisory Group consider initial representations in August with a view to finalising a response on behalf of the Town Council at the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2021. This item would therefore be on the agenda for consideration at the next meeting. It was **RESOLVED** that:

**The update be noted.**

### 25.2. Proposed Cycleway Improvements – River Road, Littlehampton

Members had before them proposals to introduce a cycleway in River Road (copy attached to the minutes). If approved, the proposed cycleway would allow cyclists to use River Road in the opposite direction to the current one-way street. This was part of a countywide programme to improve cycleways and was proposed on the basis that it would provide a safer route for cyclists than using the B2187 Terminus Road up to Ferry Footbridge. In view of the tight deadline on the consultation the Advisory Group was invited to comment on the plans. Observing that this was a popular route with cyclists, the Advisory Group considered the proposals were sensible except for the inclusion of Small Croft Close. This was a tiny cul-de-sac and Members questioned the rationale for its inclusion within the scheme. In all other respects the scheme was viewed as logical. It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**The River Road Cycleway Improvement proposals be endorsed, except for the inclusion of the Small Croft Close element and that in accordance with the decision made by Full Council on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, authority be delegated to the Town Clerk to inform the County Council of the Advisory Group's comments.**

## 26. Public Forum

In accordance with the Remote Meetings Protocol introduced by the Town Council, members of the public who wished to address the Council or any of

its committees during a remote meeting should have emailed their representations one clear working day before the meeting. There were two:

**26.1. Representation From: Councillor Michelle Molloy who asked:**

“Regarding the response from West Sussex County Council relating to the Speed limit on the Fitzalan Link Road. Would the committee take into consideration the possibility of contacting the Royal Society for Prevention against Accidents (ROSPA), or any other independent road safety expert, that offer an independent road safety evaluation service for private and public organisations.

In reply to Mr Elkins response I cannot help but feel the following sentence is a poor excuse. Where speed limits are set unrealistically low for the particular road function and condition, it may be ineffective, and drivers may not comply with the speed. A speed limit is set and if drivers are choosing to not comply with said limit, they are in fact breaking the law, which is an issue of its own and can be dealt with accordingly.

We are talking about one continued stretch of road that is rather short. Is there evidence to show that the 10mph difference in speed for the last 0.09 of a mile of the road heavily effects the function of the link road. And if there is at what point do the County Council weigh up a child’s safety and compare it to how quickly we can get the traffic flowing?”.

**Response:**

We thank Councillor Molloy for her representation and are grateful to her for highlighting the availability of independent road safety assessment services through trusted organisations such as ROSPA. Initial enquiries with ROSPA have however confirmed that their services are about road safety interventions, for example courses and training and evaluating the effectiveness of them. They are not qualified engineers who can go out and assess a road or provide a road safety engineering assessment of a highway. Members will take this and Councillor Molloy’s representation into consideration when they come to consider this matter later in the meeting.

**26.2. Representation From: Mr Chester who asked:**

“With regard to the County Council proposals for the A259. I'm delighted that the Wick roundabout is to be retained with its delightful trees. However, the proposal to move the entrance to Hawthorne Road & Morrisons from the roundabout to Lyminster Road threatens to breach the screening of trees which serves the homes opposite well

and would subject them to more noise and disturbance. It also raises the prospect of dangerous right turns from vehicles exiting Morrisons and the businesses behind it. It makes little sense to decide on such fundamental changes before the impact of the opening the full length of the Lyminster Bypass is assessed in a few years' time. I would therefore suggest that the Wick roundabout element of the proposals is left out of the scheme enabling resource to be focused where it is more needed."

**Response:**

We thank Mr Chester for his representation which has been noted. This has also been shared with the County Council Officers attending this meeting and will be addressed by them during their presentation. Members will also take this into consideration when they come to consider responding to the consultation.

**27. A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement Scheme**

- 27.1. The Chair welcomed Mr H C Hii, WSCC Project Manager for the scheme and Mr Hyde from the County Council's consultants WSP, who presented details of the changes proposed to the A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton corridor. The Scheme was a continuation of the improvement works already underway further east on the A259 and aimed to utilise the funding stream available from the Government dedicated to delivering improvements major roads for all users.
- 27.2. The purpose of the current consultation was to get the views of the wider public to inform the next phase of preliminary design work and support the business case that would need to be submitted with the bid for funding to the Department for Transport. It was anticipated that this would lead to further refinements to the Scheme which would be subject to additional consultation further down the line. This consultation had attracted a lot of interest and the deadline had therefore been extended to 15<sup>th</sup> August 2021.
- 27.3. The Scheme for the Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor was comprised of ten junction improvements which aimed to address current issues taking into consideration local growth and other planned improvements on this section of the A259. Mr Hyde proceeded to explain the proposals as they related to the roundabouts at Bridge Road (Tesco) and Wick (Morrisons). It was noted that the section of road that bridged the River Arun was outside of the scope of this scheme. Acknowledging the public forum representation, Mr Hyde emphasised that the proposal to close off the Hawthorn Road arm of the Wick roundabout aimed to address safety concerns and congestion at this point.
- 27.4. The presentation was paused to allow members to consider these

aspects of the Scheme. This led to a discussion around the rationale for the changes at these points. There was a strong view that they were not sufficient to address the current congestion issues and that the proposals had not realistically considered the impact of other potential large-scale developments; for example, the possible introduction of further development at Hampton Quay impacting the Bridge Road roundabout and the possible increase in the waste facilities at Ford. It was also thought that the proposal to close off the Hawthorn Road arm of the Wick roundabout could be more dangerous, could simply displace the current congestion and given its proximity to the level crossing, would be better left unchanged. Scrutiny of the rationale for these changes highlighted that the baseline calculations used to predict future needs was based on 2016 data and it was confirmed that these would be re-calculated using more recent data from 2019. It was also noted that the modelling only took into account approved development and that the impact of planning applications which had yet to be determined were not factored in. It was however confirmed that the approved Lymminster Bypass scheme which would have a significant impact on the A284, had been included in the modelling. In response to a question about whether dualling of this stretch of the A259 had been considered, it was explained that due to the changes in traffic flows and constraints at either end of the scheme, dualling was not deemed effective.

- 27.5. The presentation resumed and further detail was provided regarding the proposed junction changes further west of Clymping. These included measures to give buses priority, rights of way improvements and facilitate other modes of transport. It was observed that the corridor was subject to fluctuating speed limits, and it was noted that these would be re-examined in the next phase of work. Mr Hii and Mr Hyde noted the points raised by Members during the presentation and the Chair thanked them for their presentation. It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**In accordance with the decision made by Full Council on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, authority be delegated to the Town Clerk to respond to the consultation with the comments of the Advisory Group as set out in minutes 27.4. to 27.5. above.**

## **28. Planning and Other District Council Matters**

### **28.1. Standing Orders / Urgent Action**

The Advisory Group received and noted an urgent action (previously circulated) relating to planning application LU/164/21PL. It was **Resolved** that:

**The Urgent Action be noted.**

## **28.2. Planning Applications – Lists 25, 26, 27 and 28**

It was **Resolved** that:

**In accordance with the decision made by Full Council on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, authority be delegated to the Town Clerk to inform the District Council of the Advisory Group's comments (appended to these Minutes as Appendix 1).**

## **28.3. Planning Application LU/116/21/PL – Land South of the Littlehampton Academy, Fitzalan Road, Littlehampton**

Councillor Tandy declared a personal interest in the following matter as an employee of the Littlehampton Academy.

Members had before them updates provided by the applicant, BokLok, intended to address the concerns of the Advisory Group about the development proposals for the Elm Grove Road site (previously circulated). In light of this information, the Advisory Group was also requested to reconsider its stance on the proposals. Members welcomed the further engagement undertaken by the applicant with the nearby schools particularly in relation to the areas of concern previously highlighted and their commitment to continue this dialogue. Overall Members were content that their original objections had been satisfactorily addressed and it was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**In accordance with the decision made by Full Council on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, authority be delegated to the Town Clerk to inform the District Council of the Advisory Group's comments.**

## **28.4. Planning Application A/129/21/PL – Rustington Golf Centre Golfers Lane Angmering.**

Councillor Long declared a personal interest in the following matter as she lived close to the proposed development.

28.4.1. The Advisory Group received details of this application which proposed a development of 191 new homes with associated landscaping, parking, and access arrangements at the Rustington Golf Centre (previously circulated). The Town Council had been specifically notified of the application which was sited close to the border of the parish to Angmering. Members raised significant concerns about the potential

loss of the green space should these plans proceed. It was considered neither appropriate or desirable to introduce more development along this stretch of the A259 which was already busy with existing and proposed development on the southern boundary and the introduction of further housing was viewed as over development of the area.

28.4.2. Commenting upon what was considered as the rapidly reducing open green spaces in the District, Members also had significant concerns about the potential loss of the green space should these plans proceed. It was considered that the application failed to recognise or offer sufficient mitigation for the loss of what was viewed as a valuable open green space providing leisure facilities and a decent environment for the growing population. It was therefore considered the site should be preserved and that the development should be resisted on the grounds that it clearly went against the Arun Local Plan Policy OSR DM1 Open Space, sport, and recreation in that:

- There was no evidence that a robust and up-to-date assessment had been undertaken which clearly showed that the facilities were surplus to requirements.
- The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision of open space, outdoor and indoor sport, community arts and cultural facilities.
- The new provision was not deemed necessary or provides quality improvements and/or new offsite provision in order to address any future demand.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**In accordance with the decision made by Full Council on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, authority be delegated to the Town Clerk to inform the District Council of the Advisory Group's objection to this proposal as set out in Minutes 28.4.1. and 28.4.2. above.**

## **29. Transportation and West Sussex County Council Matters**

### **29.1. Fitzalan Link Road Speed Limit**

At the meeting of the Full Council Advisory Group on 24th June 2021, Members considered that the response of the local Highways Authority to the request for a 30mph speed limit on the Link Road failed to recognise the road safety needs of the new school planned in the vicinity and wished to pursue a review of the speed limit. Reflecting further on the matter, Members considered the representation made during the public forum and the environmental implications of varying speed limits. Concerns were expressed regarding the environmental

implications of constant changes in speed limits, further supporting the case for a 30mph speed limit throughout the length of the road. Reflecting on the conversation earlier in the meeting regarding the A259 Bognor Regis to Littlehampton Corridor Enhancement Scheme, Members also recalled that the County Council expected to revisit the fluctuating speed limits that existed on this stretch of road and wished to see the same action here. It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**In accordance with the decision made by Full Council on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021, authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair of the Advisory Group, to send a further letter to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport t setting out the Advisory Group's views as set out above.**

### **30. Rampion 2**

30.1. Members had before them an update (previously circulated) on the consultation timetable and how it would be conducted. This was in response to the submission made by the Advisory Group regarding the statement of community engagement published by the developers. The formal public consultation on the proposed wind farm development had now commenced and would close on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2021. In terms of responding, it was proposed that the Advisory Group consider initial representations in August with a view to finalising a response on behalf of the Town Council at the meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2021. This item would therefore be on the agenda for consideration at the next meeting.

30.2. Members were encouraged by the response that had been received and also noted that the consultation period had been extended to nine weeks. Members also wished to pursue the proposed virtual community meeting which the project team planned to hold for Littlehampton and Clymping Parishes. It was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**The update be noted, and the project team contacted to progress the virtual community meeting for Littlehampton and Clymping Parishes.**

### **31. Members Training**

The Assistant Town Clerk reported that further dates had been obtained to run refresher training for members on planning matters. The Advisory Group considered it would be beneficial for this training to be offered to all Councillors and it was therefore **RESOLVED** that:

**The new dates be circulated to all Councillors with a view to arranging a training session in August.**

**32. Masterplan – North Littlehampton**

There was nothing further to report.

**33. Exempt Business**

There was none.

The meeting closed at 8.03 pm.

---

**CHAIR**

Appendix 1

**Littlehampton Town Council  
Planning & Transportation Committee Monday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2021  
Representation on Lists 25, 26, 27 & 28**

<b>Plan List No.</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Ward Councillor</b>	<b>Planning No.</b>	<b>Details of Application</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Comments</b>
25	Beach	BW	LU/182/21/HH	Garage conversion	3 Trinity Way Littlehampton BN17 5SR	No Objection
26	Brookfield	AT	LU/190/21/A	Installation of a free standing sign	Yeomans Vauxhall 52 Horsham Road Littlehampton	No objection subject to ensuring that all safety requirements relating to the signage are met.
27	River	IB/WT	LU/194/21/HH	Single storey rear extension	1 St Marys Way Littlehampton BN17 5QG	No Objection
27	Wick		LU/197/21/HH	Erection of single storey rear extension following the demolition of existing conservatory	16 Madehurst Way Littlehampton BN17 6HD	No Objection