

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held in The New Millennium Chamber, Manor House, Church Street, Littlehampton BN17 5EW on MONDAY 28 February 2022 at 6.30 pm

Present:

Councillor Long – Chair
Councillor Buckland
Councillor Tandy
Councillor Woodman

2021 to 2022

114. Evacuation Procedures

The evacuation procedures were noted.

115. Filming of Council Meetings, Use of social media and Mobile Phones

The procedures were noted.

116. Apologies

There were apologies from Councillors Turner and Tilbrook.

117. 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.

118. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 31 January 2022, previously circulated, were confirmed as a true record and were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

119. Chair's Report and Urgent Items

There were none.

120. Public Forum

There were six members of the public present. The Committee heard three representations regarding the Rampion 2 wind farm development as follows:

- 120.1. Mr Haas on behalf of the Littlehampton Society and East Beach Residents Association asked that Councillors take note of the correspondence with Arun District Council, West Sussex County Council, and the Planning Inspectorate on the resumption of Rampion 2 community consultations. And that Arun District Council's Chief Executive Officer had passed this correspondence directly to the applicant. He added that West Sussex County Council Officers and the Planning Inspectorate's Rampion 2 Case Team had acknowledged this, both saying a full response would be provided shortly.

He also asked, regarding the reopened Rampion 2 consultations to 11 April 2022, whether the Town could consider holding an open public meeting in the Millennium Chamber for Town Councillors and residents, directly inviting Dr Colin Ross and RWE to make in-person presentations and other presentations followed by open Questions and Answers. A precedent was Middleton-on-Sea Parish Council inviting RWE to its 25 August 2021 special meeting on Rampion 2 during the former consultation round ending 16 Sept 2021.

- 120.2. In response it was confirmed that all information that had been received from the Littlehampton Society and East Beach Residents Association had been shared with Members. The Committee was very aware of the sensitivities surrounding these plans and noted the open meetings that had already been held about these proposals. The Committee maintained the position that the Local Impact Assessment proposed by Arun District Council would be essential in helping Members come to a view. It was agreed that a copy of the Town Council's initial response to the Rampion 2 consultation would be forwarded to Mr Haas. It was also noted that the Littlehampton Society had commissioned their own local impact report which would be shared with the Town Council when completed.
- 120.3. Mrs Crossley stated that there had been many representations to councillors about the consultation process of the RWE new windfarm proposal. Highlighting the Local Government Association 2019 guidance, Probity in Planning, she noted that Members needed to avoid the appearance of bias or having predetermined views or having a closed mind. The rules also stated that councillors with no pecuniary interest could vote on matters that they had researched and that decisions could not be made on a party-political basis.

As the information given by RWE to the public was in her view woefully inadequate, she suggested it was better that everyone gathered facts from scientists that had correct information, and then inform people. She therefore asked for assurance from the Council that members had gathered all the technical information that was freely available about the effects of the RWE windfarm, and that might not be in RWE's planning application, to

enable them to fully participate in the decision-making procedure. She also asked if the Town council were doing their own Local Impact Report, and if so when it would be made public as she had heard Arun District Council were not taking theirs forward.

- 120.4. In response it was stated that the Town Council was a consultee in the planning process that would determine this application. Members, like many, were laypeople and had been free to access, gather and read all material that had been published regarding these proposals. The Town Council was not doing a local impact report or aware of any decision by the District Council not to progress their impact assessment. As previously stated, the Town Council was waiting for the District Council's Local Impact Assessment which would be essential in helping Members come to a view.
- 120.5. The Assistant Town Clerk read out a written submission on behalf of Mrs Tyrrell who asked for an update on the Committee's discussion about Rampion2 at the last meeting and sought an update on progress with the District Council's Impact Assessment and whether Dr Ross had been asked to speak to the Council.
- 120.6. In response it was confirmed that whilst there was no plan to invite Dr Ross or RWE to a meeting, Members were very aware of the sensitivities surrounding these plans and would consider all the representations that were received on this matter.
- 120.7. The Assistant Town Clerk read out a written submission on behalf of Mr Chester regarding the A27 Arundel Bypass. Mr Chester stated that much had changed over the course of the years the Town Council had been asked for a view on this. Primarily the declaration of a climate emergency, the various proposed routes, and a better understanding of the ecological damage the proposal would have and the devastating impact this current proposal would have on the villages of Binsted and Walberton in particular. Tonight, the committee would be looking at the impact on Littlehampton. He attended the exhibition last week and found the following matters clarified. There would be no junction at Ford. The figure in the brochure of an increase of traffic at the North end of Lyminster Road, just south of Crossbush of 72% was accurate, and primarily made up of traffic seeking to access the new road from the West. This far exceeded the traffic estimates used to inform the design of the Lyminster Bypass, further much of this would be using the A259 to get to the new road before heading north. Part of that section was the A259 between Wick roundabout and Highdown Drive roundabout, single file and unable to be widened due to the proximity of residential properties. The proposal before the Committee would therefore in his view exacerbate traffic congestion in and around Littlehampton and he asked the Committee to object to it.
- 120.8. In response the Committee thanked Mr Chester for his comments which would be taken into consideration when Members came to discuss the consultation later in the meeting.
- 120.9. The Assistant Town Clerk read out a written submission on behalf of Ms Le Moine regarding Public Transport and asked why more wasn't being done to enable people to use public transport by providing a better service. She

stated that public transport in Littlehampton could be improved and highlighted that the train to London seemed to needlessly take forever and considered that one train an hour could go from Littlehampton to Victoria via Arundel. There was also a need for more frequent small buses and fewer huge empty buses, and she suggested a new bus route Barnham, Yapton, Clymping, Littlehampton Town Centre, Littlehampton Morrisons, Ford, and Arundel and then return. This would link up Barnham, Littlehampton Ford and Arundel Stations allowing multiple choices of trains east, west, south, and north. Noting that more housing was planned in these areas she felt this or a bus to Arundel via Ford timed to enable people in Littlehampton to catch the faster London to Brighton train would be beneficial. Lamenting the lack of a Sunday service she added that families without a car would be helped by such a move. She also questioned running huge infrequent empty buses and commenting on the regeneration works in the High Street she commented that in her view the money would be better spent on improving public transport which in turn encourage a broader retail offer in the Town.

- 120.10. In response the Committee thanked Ms Le Moine for her presentation. Whilst the Town Council strived for improvements to strategic transport links, the delivery of public transport was not a matter that was within its remit.

Regarding bus services particular, the Town council had expressed views similar to those stated in the representation when consulted on bus service provision. In terms of improvements, these comments had focussed on the current 700 bus route which it was thought might better serve residents if made into shorter routes, incorporating new housing developments, and improving access to local facilities.

It was also noted that the Town Council had some experience of this in the past when trialling a local bus service funded by developer contributions. This had shown that despite efforts over several years to promote and deliver a local bus service connecting the town centre with the new developments in North Littlehampton, the service was not well used and hugely expensive.

In terms of train services, the Town Council had expressed support for the Arundel Chord rail link which if implemented would be a strategic transport improvement. Whilst this again was not within the Council's remit, it would support any move by the relevant bodies to put this in place.

The Town Council acknowledged that in area experiencing increased growth in housing would always need to improved public transport services however, the Town did benefit from being a major stopping point and terminus for both bus and train services which alongside the current investment in the High Street would encourage investment in the Town Centre.

121. Planning and Other District Council Matters

121.1. Standing Orders, Urgent Action

The Committee received and noted an urgent action, previously circulated, relating to planning application LU/370/21.

It was Resolved that:

The urgent Action be noted.

121.2. Planning Applications – Lists 5, 6 and 7

There were no applications for List 8.

It was Resolved that:

The representations of the Council, appended to these Minutes as Appendix 1, be forwarded to Arun District Council.

122. Transportation and West Sussex County Council Matters

122.1. A27 Arundel Bypass Statutory Consultation

- 122.1.1. The Committee received a report summarising details of the National Highways proposed grey route for the A27 Arundel Bypass. Although not the Council's preferred route, the lack of decent highways infrastructure in the area was viewed as a major barrier to economic growth and the future prosperity of the Town. This was a primary concern, and it was therefore considered important that the Council maintain its support for the Bypass. The Committee proceeded to consider the plans in more detail and discussion focused on the impact of the proposals as they related to the junctions at Crossbush and Ford.
- 122.1.2. The Town Council had previously supported the inclusion within the Bypass scheme of improvements to the junction at Ford. This was based on supporting the potential growth of housing which if realised would place an additional burden on the local highways network. This chimed with the representation made earlier in the public forum which Members considered highlighted the impact that the new bypass could have on the wider local network. It was however also acknowledged that any new bypass route was likely to either exacerbate existing local issues or create new ones but that this should not prevent the scheme progressing. Members therefore considered it imperative that the discussion between National Highways, Arun District and West Sussex County Council's aimed at finding a long-term solution for Ford should continue.
- 122.1.3. Members went on to consider the new junction arrangement at Crossbush in terms of the impact on the operation of the Lyminster Bypass and how it linked to the new development in North Littlehampton. Although the County Council were understood to be planning improvements at the point where the Lyminster Bypass joined the A284, Members felt that the projected increase in traffic as stated in the public forum had been overlooked. The enhancements planned by the County Council were aimed at improving

access for pedestrians, equestrian and cycle users only and there also appeared to be no plan to change or improve how the Crossbush motorway services were accessed. This was viewed as something which could also exacerbate the existing queuing problems at this point in the network. More clarity was therefore required regarding how this would work as part of the wider highway network especially when a gap remained before traffic reached the new junction at Crossbush. It was noted that the County Council were seeking more detailed information on this point and again, Members emphasised the importance of National Highways and the County Council' continuing to work together to find a solution.

- 122.1.4. In conclusion Members also questioned the 50 mile per hour speed limit believing that it would have little benefit in terms of alleviating congestion and was unrealistic particularly as a 60 mile per hour speed limit was more common on this type of highway. Overall, Members remained supportive of the Bypass and emphasised the need for the ongoing discussions between National Highways, Arun District and West Sussex County Council's to continue.

It was Resolved therefore that:

The Town Council's support for the Bypass be re-iterated and that authority be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair of the Committee to draft a response to the Consultation incorporating Member's views as set out above.

123. Masterplan – North Littlehampton

There was nothing further to report.

124. Exempt Business

There was none.

The meeting closed at 7.47 pm.

Chair

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee 28 February 2022
Representation on Lists 5, 6, 7 & 8

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
5	Wickbourne	JL/FT	LU/12/22/PL	New vehicular cross over. This site is in CIL Zone (Zero Rated) as other development	Wick Information Centre 76 Wick Street Littlehampton BN17 7JS	No objection
5	River	IB	LU/18/22/PD	Notification for prior approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class MA for the change of use from commercial, business & service (Class E) to 1 No dwelling house (Class C3).	10 Bayford Road Littlehampton BN17 5HL	No objection, subject to receipt of a satisfactory flood risk assessment as requested by the Environment Agency.
5	Beach	WT	LU/20/22/HH	Erection of two storey rear extension.	33 The Hooe Littlehampton BN17 6PS	No objection
5	Beach	WT	LU/23/22/HH	Single storey wrap around rear extension. (This application affects the character and appearance of the Littlehampton Sea Front Conservation Area)	23 Norfolk Road Littlehampton BN17 5PW	No objection. The committee had no objection and supported the comments of the Arun District Conservation Area Advisory Panel.
5	Courtwick with Toddington	JL/FT	LU/27/22/HH	Erection of two storey side extension following the demolition of single storey detached garage	103 Griffin Crescent Littlehampton BN17 7LH	No objection
7	River	IB	LU/3/22/CLE	Lawful Development Certificate for the existing planning permission LU/287/17/PL 'Demolition of existing buildings, change of use of & erection of 1 No. building incorporate office (B1) at ground floor & 8 No. dwellings at first and second floor.' has been implemented and is extant.	46a & 47 & Land north of Clifton Road Littlehampton BN17 5LW	No objection

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee 28 February 2022
Representation on Lists 5, 6, 7 & 8

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
7	Courtwick with Toddington	JL/FT	LU/5/22/PL	Change of use from a single dwelling into two flats and rear two storey extension and rear dormer. This application is in CIL Zone 2 (Zero Rated) as flats.	37 Griffin Crescent Littlehampton BN17 7LH	Objection. Overdevelopment of the site and out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. The accommodation on the ground floor also did not meet the space standards
7	Beach	BW	LU/16/22/HH	Replace fire escape at rear of building. (This application may affect the character and appearance of the Littlehampton Sea Front Conservation Area and a Listed Building).	Second Floor Flat 36 South Terrace Littlehampton BN17 5NU	No objection
7	Beach	WT	LU/17/22/L	Listed building consent for the replace fire escape at rear of building.	Second Floor Flat 36 South Terrace Littlehampton BN17 5NU	No objection
7	River	IB	LU/30/22/PL	Extension of first floor rear balconies at 32 & 33 Mariners Quay (resubmission of LU/349/20/HH). This application affects the character & appearance of the Littlehampton, River Road Conservation Area and is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	32 & 33 Mariners Quay River Road Littlehampton BN17 5DA	Objection. The Committee endorsed the comments of the Arun District Conservation Area Advisory Panel and considered that the previous objection comments stand in that it is out of character and that the nature of the proposal was obtrusive and would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbours. It was also observed that the original design by its very nature avoided this issue and there was concern that if approved this would set a precedent.

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee 28 February 2022
Representation on Lists 5, 6, 7 & 8

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
7	Courtwick with Toddington	JL/FT	LU/36/22/HH	Single storey side extension	1 Coleridge Crescent Littlehampton BN17 7FJ	Objection. Proposals were considered to be an overdevelopment of the site and out of keeping when compared to existing development in the vicinity.
7	Wickbourne	JL/FT	LU/38/22/HH	Loft conversion with dormers to front and rear elevations	31 Grand Avenue Littlehampton BN17 7NG	Objection. Overdevelopment by virtue by mass and bulk of the proposed extension.
7	River	IB	LU/40/22/PL	Replacement of shopfront with UPVC windows and new front door to front elevation in addition to installation of new UPVC to rear elevation. This application is in CIL Zone 4 and is not CIL liable as other development.	10 Bayford Road Littlehampton BN17 5HL	No objection, subject to receipt of a satisfactory flood risk assessment as requested by the Environment Agency.