

**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 20 June 2022 at 6.30 pm**

Present:

Councillor Tandy – Chair
Councillor Buckland
Councillor Long
Councillor Turner

2022 to 2023

12. Evacuation Procedures

The evacuation procedures were noted.

13. Filming of Council Meetings, Use of Social Media and Mobile Phones

The procedures were noted.

14. Apologies

There were apologies from Councillor Tilbrook.

15. 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.

Councillor Long declared a personal interest in item 19.2, Planning Application A/129/21/PL, as a member of Lanes Health Club.

16. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2022, previously circulated, were confirmed as a true record and were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

17. Chair's Report and Urgent Items

None.

18. Public Forum

There was one member of the public present.

Councillor Chace addressed the Committee from the public gallery in a personal capacity as the applicant regarding planning application LU/158/22/PL, Mewsbrook Park Trading Kiosk.

- 18.1. Speaking of the history of the application, he stated that the scheme envisaged redeveloping the existing building that housed the public toilets to create a new café with toilets. Once completed the existing café would be demolished to make way for further outdoor seating. He went on to explain that originally, it was planned to make the toilets accessible from the outside and fitted with digital locks so that the facilities could be accessed when the café was closed. This element of the original plans had however been discounted by the District Council who considered that the toilet provision would be better monitored if it was part of the café. This had led to the final design as set out in the current planning application. He also reported that the building would be cladded with the final design detail to be agreed with the District Council as part of the planning approval. He asked that the Committee take his representation into consideration when they came to consider the item.

The Chair thanked Councillor Chace for his representation which was noted, and he then left the meeting.

19. Planning and Other District Council Matters

19.1. Planning Applications – Lists 21, 22, 23 and 24

19.1.1. Planning Application LU/132/22/PL, River Breeze Restaurant, 56 to 57 Pier Road

The Committee received and considered the above planning application which proposed converting the ground floor retail provision into two apartments. Recalling the history behind this development, Members considered the loss of retail provision in a prime tourist location was unacceptable. This view was supported by the District Council's Economic Development Team who, in response to the original application to develop the site, had commented that they wished to see "an active frontage maintained." The Committee therefore judged that the plans went against this advice and Members were of the strong view that this application should be opposed.

Observing that this type of application was becoming more common particularly in the Town Centre, Members also wished to investigate options to prevent the proliferation of this type of development in the area. In this respect it was suggested that an Article 4 Directive was an option and that

this should be researched and considered by the Policy and Finance Committee for inclusion in the Town Centre Strategy.

The Committee therefore Resolved to:

1. Object to the application and that Member's views as set out in Minute 19.1.1. above be sent to the District Council.
2. The Policy and Finance Committee be **Recommended** to include a policy to preserve the retail in the local Town and Tourist Centres as part of the Town Centre Strategy and research an Article 4 Directive with the District Council to support this.

19.1.2. Planning Application LU/158/22/PL, Mewsbrook Park Trading Kiosk

The Committee received and considered the above planning application which proposed changes at the above facility to create a new café including the change of use of the existing public conveniences. Discussion focussed on the impact the scheme would have on the public conveniences. Members had serious reservations about the reduction in the provision in terms of the number and availability which appeared to be driven by the proposed opening hours of the café. This was viewed as a retrograde step in an area that was both a prominent and popular visitor destination. Members otherwise had no objection in principle to the scheme, the design of which was considered a welcome addition to the park.

This prompted Members to consider the impact of the reduction in the provision of public conveniences in such a popular seaside location. Observing that Council had at various times expressed concerns at the deficit in provision throughout the Town, Members wished to ensure that this was covered in the evolving Town Centre Strategy. It was also considered appropriate that the Policy and Finance Committee be requested to consider making a representation to the District Council expressing concerns at the loss of public conveniences in the Town in the strongest possible terms.

It was therefore Resolved that:

1. The Committee's views as set out in Minute 19.1.2. above be sent to the District Council.
2. The Policy and Finance Committee be **Recommended** to consider making a representation to the District Council regarding the loss of public conveniences in the Town.

19.1.3. Regarding Planning Application LU/167/22/PL, Councillor Turner requested that her objection to the application be noted.

It was Resolved that:

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

19.2. Planning Application – A/129/21/PL, Rustington Golf Centre, Angmering

Members received the Notice of Appeal relating to the above application. It was noted that all representations made at the application stage had been forwarded to the Planning Inspectorate.

It was Resolved that:

The update be noted.

19.3. Compliance Strategy Consultation

- 19.3.1. The Committee was asked to consider and comment upon Arun District Council's updated compliance strategy for managing breaches of planning control, previously circulated. Overall, it was considered that in streamlining the Strategy, some of the changes may not be in the best interests of residents and did not accurately reflect issues that were commonly raised with and by Members. The Committee proceeded to review the revised Strategy and discussion focussed on the prioritisation of cases and the reporting mechanism.
- 19.3.2. The following points were noted from the ensuing discussion. Houses in multiple occupation were considered to have been incorrectly categorised and should be a major breach. Members were of the strong view that every breach, however minor should be recorded. As with crime and antisocial behaviour, Members considered it imperative that residents had confidence in the system and were encouraged to report breaches, however minor. There was concern that if minor breaches were not registered, important evidence would be lost that could prevent a minor issue becoming a major breach. It also went against the District Council's objective that it relied "on the knowledge of local people, Ward members and Town and Parish councils to identify non-compliance matters of the Strategy" – Section 13 of the Strategy. It was also considered that the District Council's ability to respond meaningfully to Freedom of Information requests would be impaired if this information was not recorded.
- 19.3.3. Observing the minimum detail requested to report a breach, Members also considered it important that the Strategy reflect that investigations should be undertaken taking into account specific times of breaches. This would reassure residents that a complaint had been thoroughly investigated. Finally, emphasising that the Strategy was only effective if it was properly enforced, Members considered it important to highlight that this area of the District Council's work urgently needed to be better resourced with both staff and an effective reporting mechanism.

It was therefore Resolved that:

The Committee's views as set out in Minutes above be forwarded to Arun District Council.

20. Transportation and West Sussex County Council Matters

There were none.

21. Masterplan – North Littlehampton

There was nothing further to report.

22. Exempt Business

There was none.

The meeting closed at 7.45 pm.

Chair

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL Planning and Transportation Committee 20 June 2022 Representation on Lists 21, 22, 23 & 24

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
21	River	IB	LU/145/22/PL	Two storey side extension and detached two storey building to north of existing house to create 4 No 3-bed dwellings. This application affects the character and appearance of the Littlehampton Seafront Conservation Area and is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as flats.	Wellesley Court Fitzalan Road Littlehampton BN17 5JW	Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment and insufficient parking. In view of the position of the building in relation to the conservation area the Town Council endorsed the comments of the Arun District Conservation Area Advisory Panel regarding flint walls and where possible that the materials used reflect the characteristics of the conservation area. Anything demolished should be replaced like for like. The Town Council also endorse the Environment Agency's objection comments.
22	River	IB	LU/152/22/CLP	Lawful development certificate for a proposed single storey extension to replace existing lean to.	37 Stanhope Road Littlehampton BN17 6AQ	No Objection
23	Wick	JL/FT	LU/163/22/HH	Conversion of garage to habitable use with addition of first floor over	2 Stanley Road Littlehampton BN17 6JE	No Objection
24	Beach	WT	LU/165/22/PL	Infill area below northeast facing first floor terrace to create new treatment room space. This site is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	Pavilion The Sportsfield St Floras Road Littlehampton BN17 6BD	No Objection

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee 20 June 2022
Representation on Lists 21, 22, 23 & 24

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
24	Wickbourne	JL/FT	LU/167/22/PL	Erection of new self-contained dwelling at side of existing terrace house. This application is in CIL Zone 4 and CIL Liable as a new dwelling.	17 Cherry Croft Littlehampton BN17 7NT	No objection, subject to the applicant providing lighting to the now restricted alleyway. Observing the requirements of the Local Plan policies: D DM1 – 6. Crime Prevention. Also D SP1 13.2.16 and 17 – Crime and Security – provide strategically placed effective lighting for crime prevention and a sense of personal and community safety. The Town council would therefore encourage the applicant to provide safety lighting for the alleyway.
24	River	IB	LU/173/22/PL	Change of use from Class C3 (a) dwelling house to Class C2 Residential Care home for adults with learning disabilities/autism and with physical and health needs. This application is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	21 Maltravers Drive Littlehampton BN17 5EY	No Objection
24	Beach		LU/176/22/TEL	Prior notification under Schedule 2, Part 16, Class A for a proposed 15m height slim line phase 9 monopole and 3 No additional ancillary equipment cabinets and associated ancillary works	Corner of Beaumont Park and Finisterre Way Littlehampton BN17 6NS	Objection on the grounds that the development would have an adverse impact on views and amenity of nearby residents and users of the shop and busy highway. At 15m high, the monopole would be above the tree level so very visible and contrary to Policy TEL DM1 of the Local Plan: 'equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged'. The development was considered too exposed, and at risk of vandalism. There were also concerns that the site is in a residential area with housing and shop well within 300 metres.