

RUSTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES: of the Meeting held on 25 April 2022

PRESENT: Councillors J Street (Chairman), J Bennett, J Ceiriog-Hughes, Mrs A Cooper, A Cooper and R Grevett

In attendance: Councillor D Rogers

35/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs Partridge (Indisposition), Tyler (Personal) and Warren (previously approved Leave of Absence). These apologies were accepted by the Committee.

36/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

Councillor Mrs Cooper declared a personal interest in Minute 39/22(g) (R/77/22/HH - Two storey side extension - 19 Sea Avenue, Rustington, refers). She remained in the Meeting during consideration of this item and took part in the discussion and vote thereon.

Councillor Cooper declared a personal interest in Minute 39/22(g) (R/77/22/HH - Two storey side extension - 19 Sea Avenue, Rustington, refers). He remained in the Meeting during consideration of this item and took part in the discussion and vote thereon.

37/22 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 April 2022 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

38/22 LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY DECISIONS

(a) 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/15/22/HH - Erection of single storey side and rear extensions, hip to gable roof extension including the installation of 3 No. dormers and alterations to existing dormers - 9 Meadway**
- R/25/22/HH - Proposed first floor rear extension and installation of a car port to front - 82 North Lane**
- R/26/22/HH - Two storey side extension comprising and single storey rear extension - 14 Glenville Road**
- R/27/22/HH - Installation of a detached garage - West Hayne, 19 Angmering Lane, East Preston**

The Committee NOTED this information.

(b) The Clerk reported that she had previously circulated a notification received from the local Planning Authority, advising that planning permission in respect of the following application was not required:-

- R/29/22/CLP - Lawful development certificate for the proposed installation of traffic calming measures by means of an automated gate, 2 No. speed humps at north end of road - Amberley Road**

The Committee NOTED this information.

- (c) The Clerk reported that she had previously circulated a notification received from the local Planning Authority, advising that planning permission in respect of the following application had been withdrawn:-

R/41/22/T - 1 No. Prunus tree (0QA8) - Crown lift to 3 metres. 1 No. Ash tree (0QAA) - Lateral prune over extended lowest N aspect limb at 2 metres by approximately 3 metres to an appropriate pruning point. Final limb length approximately 2.5-3 metres - On verge at junction of The Street and Broadmark Lane

The Committee NOTED this information.

39/22 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Clerk reminded the Committee that Councillor Warren's own comments in respect of all of the Planning Applications which were scheduled to be considered, had been circulated to all Members as part of the Agenda (Item 6(b) refers). She also referred to the PowerPoint Presentation which had been produced and circulated to all Members prior to the Meeting.

- (a) **A/45/22/PL - Erection of 167 No. new homes in a mix of 1-4 bedroom properties (2-4 bedroom homes and 1 bedroom apartments), with associated landscaping, parking, open space, play areas, construction of a new vehicular access from Golfers Lane and all other associated development works (resubmission following A/129/21/PL). This application is a departure from the Development Plan and is in CIL Zone 3 and is CIL Liable as new dwellings - Rustington Golf Centre, Golfers Lane, Angmering**

The Clerk reminded the Committee of Agenda Item 6(a) and its previous decision at the Planning Committee Meeting held on 25 April 2022 (Minute 33/22(g) refers) where it was agreed that Councillors Mrs Cooper and Warren, together with the Clerk and Mrs Harris, be authorised to further research all of the documentation submitted by the Applicant and prepare detailed suggested objections to this Application, for consideration and anticipated approval at its next Meeting.

Following a detailed discussion, the Committee AGREED to the following objections:-

- The site is outside of the Built-Up Area boundaries of Angmering and Rustington and, therefore, its development for dwellings would be contrary to Arun Local Plan Policy SD SP2 and the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan Policy HD3. The adverse impacts of this development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, as set out below
- The development would result in the loss of an extensively used sports and leisure facility, the main users being school aged children, often with their parents and young adults; whilst at the same time adding more residents to the Parish of Angmering who would need such facilities. This would be contrary to Policy OSR DM1 of the Arun Local Plan
- The development would create a separate enclave of dwellings which would have no relationship with either Angmering or Rustington. The site is separated from Angmering by open farmland within the Angmering to Rustington/East Preston Gap and from Rustington by the A259, commercial development and the railway line. This is likely to result in new residents not feeling part of either community and being less likely to use services and facilities within them or contribute to community life. It would, therefore, be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 8 - Social Objective - to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, and Paragraph 39 of the National Design Guide which seeks to foster a sense of belonging and contribute to "well-being, inclusion and community cohesion"
- The development would still not be sustainable because of its severance from the nearest community of Rustington by the A259. The measures now proposed to provide crossing

points and other active travel opportunities are still inadequate, will be viewed as dangerous by potential users due to the speed and volume of vehicles on the A259 and are unlikely to convince any future residents to use modes of transport other than the private car to access services and facilities including local schools. It would therefore be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 105 which says that “Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes”

- The proposed Toucan Crossing which is the recommended means by which pedestrians and cyclists access the majority of Rustington facilities is still of great concern. The speed survey that has been conducted clearly shows that a proportion of the traffic on the A259 travels in excess of 50mph at this point. It is also noted that very little consideration has been given to the west bound traffic on this crossing and based on the information submitted there are great concerns on the appropriateness of this crossing especially in terms of the determination of stopping sight distance for westbound traffic, and the potential build-up of traffic exiting from Mill Lane in this scenario
- None of the three Rustington Primary Schools are within a mile of the proposed development and due to the dangers of the A259 all children of this age will require adult supervision. It is almost certain that all daily journeys will, therefore, be by car, further promoting unhealthy travelling and increased pressure on the already very busy Mill Lane roundabout at peak times
- The development would result in a significant break in the continuous “green” corridor on the north side of the A259 between the Body Shop Roundabout, and Station Road, Angmering. This would substantially reduce the rural nature of the landscape in this area. In addition, the “stands” of substantial trees, mainly Monterey Pines, on this site and the adjoining Gap Between Settlements, also on this side of the A259, are a distinctive landscape feature seen across open space and that landmark view would be lost on this site. One of the reasons the local Planning Authority Officers gave for the refusal of a previous Application, A/100/21/T, to fell 12 of these Pines on the adjoining Gap was: “These high-profile trees of significant landscape and visual amenity; whose value extends beyond their individual worth”. The Report also refers to them as “an important landscape feature”. The loss of this green infrastructure and landscape features would be contrary to Policies GI SP1 and LAN DM1 of the Arun Local Plan
- The development would result in increased flooding in the area due to the amount of hard surfacing and buildings proposed which would reduce the current infiltration of water into the soil. It is noted that the District Council’s Drainage Engineer has lodged a holding objection due to the inadequacy of the information provided on drainage of surface water from the site. Allowing this development would therefore be contrary to NPPF paragraph 167 which says “When determining any planning applications, local Planning Authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere”
- The Mill Lane/A259 Roundabout was not included in the Parsons Brinkerhoff A259 Route Improvement Study of 2013, and two developments have been built since. The comments of West Sussex County Council Highways on the capacity of this roundabout take no account of the traffic congestion and tailbacks that currently occur at peak times

Traffic often backs up to the B2187 roundabout junction and beyond. The majority of traffic coming from the Rustington area turns right towards Worthing and at peak times a very high proportion illegally use the inside lane for this turn, often failing to signal their intentions and thus creating a potentially dangerous situation. Numerous accidents and verbal altercations between motorists occur, and further traffic from this development can only worsen the situation, contrary to Policy T SP1 of the Arun Local Plan and TM1 of the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan.

(b) R/64/22/HH - Erection of single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and new lean to roof to front elevation following removal of existing side balcony - 36 Frobisher Way, Rustington

The Committee AGREED to object to this application on the following grounds:-

- (a) The proposal for a first floor side extension, because of its mass and height, would be overbearing and overshadowing, and would, therefore, have a detrimental effect on the visual amenities and quiet enjoyment of the neighbouring property, namely No. 34 Frobisher Way. It would also result in a loss of light for the aforementioned property.

The Committee also AGREED a Neighbour Notification.

(c) R/67/22/HH - Erection of single storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory - 2 The Oaks, Rustington

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

(d) R/73/22/HH - Erection of single storey rear extension - 22 Hide Gardens, Rustington

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

(e) R/75/22/HH - Removal of the existing conservatory and replacement with a two storey rear extension, plus a front infill extension and an increased ridge height with a new dormer to the East of the property - 10 Acre Close, Rustington

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

(f) R/81/22/HH - Single storey side extension. (This application may affect the character and appearance of the Rustington Conservation Area) - 55 The Street, Rustington

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

(Prior to consideration of the following item Councillors Mrs Cooper and Cooper had declared a personal interest, as Members of the Sea Estate Residents' Association)

(g) R/77/22/HH - Two storey side extension - 19 Sea Avenue, Rustington

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

Chairman: **Date:**