

## **RUSTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES:** of the Meeting held on 7 July 2008

**PRESENT:** Councillors M Warrington (in the Chair), J Ceiriog-Hughes, J Collins, Mrs S Lines and S Perry

---

#### **63/08            CHAIRMAN OF THE MEETING**

In the absence of Councillor Grevett, Chairman of the Committee, Councillor Warrington was elected Chairman of the Meeting.

#### **64/08            APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Grevett (Work Commitment). This apology was accepted by the Committee.

#### **65/08            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ceiriog-Hughes declared a prejudicial interest in Minute 68/08(a) – (R/299/07 – Demolition of 11, 15, 17, 19 and 21 Manor Road and erection of 39 No. Extra Care Apartments and 1 No. apartment for manager – 11-21 Manor Road and 121 Worthing Road, Rustington refers). He left the Meeting during consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion and vote thereon.

#### **66/08            MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 June 2008 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### **67/08            LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY DECISIONS**

The Clerk reported that she had previously circulated notifications, received from the local Planning Authority, advising that planning permission in respect of the following applications had been granted conditionally:-

- R/66/08        – Construction of new house – 29 Sea Avenue, Rustington**
- R/111/08      – New shopfront – 7 Sterling Parade, The Street, Rustington**
- R/112/08A    – Illuminated box and projecting sign – 7 Sterling Parade, The Street, Rustington**
- R/114/08      – Installation of an ATM – 7 Sterling Parade, The Street, Rustington**
- R/125/08T    – Fell 1 No. Beech Tree – 126 Sea Lane, Rustington**
- R/127/08      – Erection of 2 storey extension at rear – 91 Old Manor Road, Rustington**
- R/128/08      – Small extension – Mill House, 3 Overstrand Avenue, Rustington**
- R/129/08      – Erection of new house – 7 Paddock Green, Rustington**

#### **68/08            PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

*(Prior to consideration of the following item, Councillor Ceiriog-Hughes declared a prejudicial interest, as he was the owner of one of the properties to be demolished)*

- (a)    R/299/07 – Demolition of 11, 15, 17, 19 and 21 Manor Road and erection of 39 No. Extra Care Apartments and 1 No. apartment for manager – 11-21 Manor Road and 121 Worthing Road, Rustington – Substitute Plans**
- 

The Clerk referred to Minute 148/07(d) and reported the receipt of substitute plans from the local Planning Authority in respect of this application.

Following consideration of the substitute plans, the Committee AGREED to reiterate its previous objections as follows:-

- (i) The proposal to develop this site by the erection of 39 Extra Care Apartments and 1 No. manager's apartment, would constitute an undesirable intensification of residential development, and would most certainly represent a severe over-development of the site
- (ii) Having regard to the limited area of the site and its relationship to existing residential properties, the proposal would give rise to an un-neighbourly form of development which would be prejudicial to the existing character, amenities and environment of the locality
- (iii) The proposal would present an over-dominant appearance and would have a detrimental impact, by reason of its height and mass, on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the street scene
- (iv) The proposal would adversely affect the amenities and quiet enjoyment of the neighbouring properties located in close proximity to the site, namely those in Manor Road and Grafton Close
- (v) The formation and use of a new access to the site would lead to an unacceptable level of disturbance to the property immediately to the west, namely Number 9 Manor Road
- (vi) The proposal would result in an excessive amount of development being dependent on a single point of access and would also be likely to attract standing vehicles which would be detrimental to the safety and free flow of traffic and would add to the hazards for highway users in this vicinity to an unacceptable degree
- (vii) The proposal, by reason of the number of units, would generate an unacceptable increase in the volume of traffic and associated activity in Manor Road, a two-lane narrow cul-de-sac, which already suffered from congestion at certain times of the day
- (viii) This type of development would, if approved, create a precedent, with the local Planning Authority finding it more and more difficult to resist similar proposals in this vicinity, the cumulative effect of which would be to alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area.

The Committee was particularly concerned that the addition of 40 properties, in this vicinity, would place excessive pressure on the existing sewage and drainage system, to the detriment of its effectiveness and efficiency.

**(b) R/146/08 – Single storey rear extension – 8 Acre Close, Rustington**

The Committee AGREED to raise no objection to this application.

**(c) R/147/08 – Demolition of detached garden building and replacement with rear extension – 4 Amberley Road, Rustington**

The Committee AGREED to raise no objection to this application, but agreed a Neighbour Notification.

**(d) R/148/08 – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 5 No. two bedroom and 1 No. one bedroom flats – 70 Woodlands Avenue, Rustington**

Following detailed consideration, the Committee AGREED to object to this application on the following grounds:-

- (i) The increased use of the existing access to the site would be likely to lead to an unacceptable level of disturbance to those properties immediately to the North and South

- (ii) The proposal would give rise to an increased movement of vehicles on to and off the public highway at this point, which would be detrimental to the safety and freeflow of traffic, and would add to the hazards for highway users to an unacceptable degree
- (iii) The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of back-land development, which would present an over-bearing and unsympathetic appearance to the occupiers of No. 68 Woodlands Avenue and Nos. 34-40 Church Road, which would be severely detrimental to their quiet enjoyment and visual amenities
- (iv) The proposal to develop this site by the erection of 5 No. 2 bedroom and 1 No. one bedroom flats would constitute an undesirable intensification of residential development, and would most certainly represent an over-development of the site
- (v) This type of back-land development would, if approved, create a precedent, with the local Planning Authority finding it more and more difficult to resist similar proposals in this vicinity, the cumulative effect of which would be to alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area
- (vi) The proposed development would be likely to attract standing vehicles which would interrupt the freeflow of traffic on the public highway and thereby add to the hazards of road users at this point, particularly in such close proximity to the entrance and exit of the Churchill Car Park, an area already severely congested during office/shop opening hours.

The Committee also AGREED a Neighbour Notification.

**(e) R/142/08 – Proposed change of roof design to approved planning permission R/68/07 – 9 Wallace Road, Rustington**

The Committee AGREED to raise no objection to this application.

**(f) R/150/08 – Erection of 6 new build apartments – 69 Broadmark Lane, Rustington**

- (i) The proposal to develop this site by the erection of 6 new build apartments, would constitute an undesirable intensification of residential development, and would most certainly represent a severe over-development of the site
- (ii) Having regard to the limited area of the site and its relationship to existing residential properties, the proposal would give rise to an un-neighbourly form of development which would be prejudicial to the existing character, amenities and environment of the locality
- (iii) The proposal would present an over-dominant appearance and would have a detrimental impact, by reason of its height and mass, on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the street scene
- (iv) The proposal, for a second floor penthouse flat with roof terrace on the eastern elevation, would present an over-bearing and unsympathetic appearance for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties to the south and north and, in particular, the bungalows in Amberley Road to the east, which would result in a loss of privacy and light by reason of overlooking and would, most certainly, adversely affect the quiet enjoyment of the occupiers of the aforementioned properties
- (v) The use of the existing access to the site would lead to an unacceptable level of disturbance to the properties immediately to the south and north, namely Nos. 67 Broadmark Lane and 1 Ravenscroft

