

17 January 2012 – At a meeting of the Committee held at County Hall, Chichester.

Present:

Mr Whittington (Chairman), Mr Blampied, Mrs Coleman, Mr Coomber, Mr Doyle, Mrs Field, Mr Hellowell, Mrs Mockridge, Mr Quirk, Mr Rogers, Mr A R H Smith and Mr Waight.

Declarations of Interest

53. In accordance with the Code of Conduct Mr Coomber declared a prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 4(a) Shoreham Footbridge as a participant on the Steering Committee that advised on the design of the footbridge and would leave the meeting room during determination of the application. Mrs Mockridge declared a prejudicial interest in relation to agenda item 4(b) Kingston Railway Wharf as an objector to the application during the consultation period and a registered speaker in opposition to the application and would leave the meeting room during determination of the application.

Minutes

54. It was noted that the list of attendees for the previous meeting of the Committee omitted to list Mrs Coleman.

55. Resolved – that subject to the amendment outlined above the minutes of the meeting held on 29 November 2011 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

56. Mr Coomber left the meeting at 10.35 a.m.

Regulation 3 Application

Adur and Worthing Councils

WSCC/056/11/SU

Replacement of existing Shoreham Harbour footbridge with new bridge suitable for pedestrians and cyclists at Shoreham Harbour, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex.

57. The Committee received a report from the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The Strategic Planning Manager introduced the report and advised the Committee of a proposed amendment to Condition 2 to include the wording *'and any subsequent amendments agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority'* in place of the last line of the condition, *'save as varied by the conditions hereafter'*. The amendment would allow for an accommodation of the proposed Shoreham Slipway in the designs if suitable plans were submitted to the County Planning Authority to change the Southern landing.

58. Brendan Whelan, Shoreham Slipway Group, spoke in opposition to the application. A study into the potential for a slipway in Shoreham had identified the site on the South of the river as a viable location. The Group was concerned that the proximity of the ramp on the Southern side of the footbridge would impinge on the proposed site of the slipway and requested that if permission was granted the

elements of the application concerning the Southern ramp and car parking be deferred until the slipway issues were resolved.

59. Tony Bathmaker, WSCC, spoke in support of the application. The footbridge was an important structure to the local community providing an essential access between the beach and the town and the existing bridge was in such a state of disrepair that it was no longer viable to maintain. Wide ranging consultation had taken place and as a result the mesh balustrades had been replaced with glass improving visibility from the bridge and addressing bridge-users concerns regarding personal safety.

60. The Committee raised those points below in the discussion that followed:

- The line of the footbridge and its impact upon the proposed Shoreham Slipway was queried.
- The safety of cyclists and pedestrians using the access to the bridge on the Northern side was queried. It was not felt that the bollards would effectively slow cyclists and the extension of the existing barrier along the A259 to opposite the bridge entrance was suggested.
- The glass balustrades and maintenance requirements were raised.
- The lighting level for the bridge was queried.
- The need for the development had been established; the existing structure was in a state of disrepair and a replacement was needed. The bridge would provide an important link for pedestrians and cyclists from Shoreham Beach to the Town.

61. The Strategic Planning Manager, provided clarification to the Committee which included those points set out below:

- The line of the footbridge ensured sufficient distance from the nearby Site of Special Scientific Interest and that there was no impact on the flood defence strategy in the harbour. The proposed amendment to Condition 2 would enable a re-examination of the final design to take account the location of the slipway.
- The mixed use of the bridge would help to slow cyclists using the access point to the North of the bridge.
- The bridge would be part of the West Sussex highway network and responsibility for maintenance and cleaning of the bridge would rest with the County Council.
- The bridge would not be an illuminated landmark but lights would be recessed into the structure to provide a lit pathway after dark.

62. An amendment to Condition 2 was proposed and approved by the Committee to include the wording: *'and any subsequent amendments agreed in writing by the County Planning Authority'*; in place of the last line of the condition, *'save as varied by the conditions hereafter'*.

63. The officer recommendation as amended by the amendment to Condition 2 was proposed, seconded and approved unanimously by the Committee.

64. Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the report and the amendment to Condition 2 set out in minute 61 above.

65. Mr Coomber rejoined the meeting at 11.05 a.m.

County Matter Application

WSSC/061/11/SU

Variation of Condition 7 to allow HGVs to leave the site between 06.00 and 07.00 on Mondays to Saturdays inclusive (retrospective) at Kingston Railway Wharf, Brighton Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 6RN.

66. The Committee received a report from the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). The Strategic Planning Manager introduced the report and advised the Committee of a correction to Condition 3 to insert the date of 21/12/2010. To clarify the routing of lorries leaving the site it was confirmed that HGVs would not use Kingston Lane due to the height restriction of the railway bridge.

67. Janet Mockridge, County Councillor for Southwick, spoke in opposition to the application. A start time of 6.00 a.m. would set a precedent for other operations in the area; the noise of employees arriving on site before 6.00 a.m. would cause a disturbance to local residents. Enforcement of previous conditions had not been carried out and it was felt that lorries unable to use Kingston Avenue would use Eastern Avenue impacting upon the amenity of residents along this route.

68. Mrs Mockridge left the meeting at 11.20 a.m.

69. Kate Matthews, First Plan, planning agents, spoke in support of the application. The application concerned three pre-loaded lorries leaving the site between 6.00 a.m. – 7.00 a.m., no other activity would occur at the site until 7.00 a.m. A noise minimisation strategy had been undertaken and incorporated into the conditions, lorries were required to be parked on site in a position ready to leave without manoeuvring and exit the site slowly without excessive revving of engines.

70. Michael Woodward, Day Group, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. The application would enable deliveries to be made in the morning to avoid congestion at delivery points in the evening. The addition of three lorry movements along the Brighton Road before 7.00 a.m. would have a minimal impact on traffic levels.

71. The Committee raised those points below in the discussion that followed:

- Retrospective applications were not particularly welcomed but it was felt that the need for the application based upon the commercial operation of the applicant had been established.
- It was acknowledged that residential properties were located close to the site but it was not felt that the lorry movements would impact upon amenity.

72. The Strategic Planning Manager, provided clarification to the Committee which included those points set out below:

- Retrospective applications required the same process and consideration as ordinary applications.
- It was acknowledged that the enforcement regime that had operated previously had not rigorously monitored and enforced conditions at the site. With changes to the enforcement team effective enforcement of conditions would now take place.

73. The officer recommendation was proposed, seconded and approved by the Committee unanimously.

74. Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

75. Mrs Mockridge rejoined the meeting at 11.40 a.m.

Report of Monitoring, Investigations, Compliance and Enforcement Work by the County Council in West Sussex

76. The Committee received and noted a report by the County Planning Manager relating to compliance and enforcement work undertaken during the period 1 April – 30 September 2011 (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). It was reported that in future the report would contain a greater level of detail regarding the sites at which there were ongoing investigations.

Update on Mineral, Waste and Regulation 3 Planning Applications

77. The Committee received and noted a report by the County Planning Manager on applications awaiting determination (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes). It was reported that appeals had been validated by the Planning Inspectorate from Stedham Sawmills against refusal of planning permission and an enforcement notice. West Sussex County Council would provide administrative support to the South Downs National Park Authority to deal with the appeals.

Report of Delegated Action

78. The Committee received and noted an amended report by the County Planning Manager, circulated at the meeting, (copy appended to the signed version of the minutes) advising of the uses of delegated powers to grant permission for development proposals under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 since the Planning Committee meeting on 29 November 2011.

Date of next meeting

79. The next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday 7 February 2012 and the site visit would be held on Friday 3 February.

The meeting ended at 11.45 a.m.

Chairman