

RUSTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES: of the Meeting held on 21 July 2025

PRESENT: Councillors Ms M Revell (Chairman), J Ceiriog-Hughes, Mrs A Cooper, A Cooper, R Grevett, G Lee, Mrs C Stevens and P Warren

64/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

65/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

Councillor Mrs Cooper declared a prejudicial interest in Minute 70/25 (LU/93/25/PL - Part demolition, conversion, refurbishment and re-elevation of Units 5 and 6 and construction of retail (food and non-food), leisure and food and beverage units (Use Class E), together with associated car parking, access, loading areas, landscaping and associated works. This application is in CIL Zone 2 and is CIL Liable - Units 5-7 Watersmead Business Park, Norway Lane/Worthing Road, Littlehampton, refers). She remained in the Meeting during consideration of this item but took no part in the vote thereon.

66/25 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 30 June 2025 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

67/25 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/70/25/PL | - Alterations to front elevation with installation of recessed shopfronts, replacement windows and replacement doors to side and rear elevations. This application is in CIL Zone 4 (zero rated) - 154 The Street |
| R/76/25/T | - 1 No. English Oak (T1) reduction to leave a height of 7 metres and a spread of 7 metres and 1 No. Portuguese Laurel (T2) reduction to leave a height of 5 metres and a spread of 5 metres - 59 Woodlands Avenue |
| R/79/25/HH | - Porch extension; construction of a pitched roof over the existing flat roof garage with a proposed guest bedroom above; vaulted ceiling over the existing lounge; external fenestration changes; addition of a veranda/covered area to the rear (serving the kitchen, lounge, and master bedroom); internal alterations; outbuilding; and associated works - 29 Pigeonhouse Lane |
| R/80/25/HH | - Erection of single storey rear extension - 1 Acre Close |
| R/91/25/HH | - Single storey rear extension to replace existing extension, a single storey side extension to create a new porch, and hip to gable conversion with a new rear dormer. New roof lights and roof lanterns. Pitch roof extended to front elevation - 19 Chaucer Avenue |

The Committee NOTED this information.

- (b) 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 withdrawn:-

- R/88/25/PL - Removal of the existing play area to create a new paved seating area in the rear garden of the existing pub. This application is in CIL Zone 4 (zero rated), may affect the character and appearance of the Rustington conservation area and may affect the setting of a listed building - Lamb Inn, 73 The Street**
- R/98/25/T - 1 No. Hazel (T3) crown lift to 3 metres from ground level and 1 No. Prunus (T4) crown lift to 3 metres from ground level - Abbotswood, Station 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 was not required:-

- R/89/25/PDH - Notification under extended permitted development rights for a single storey rear extension, extending 4.7 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house, with a maximum height of 3.5 metres and an eaves height of 2.7 metres - Hedingham House, The Roundway, Rustington**

The Committee NOTED this information.

68/25 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Clerk reminded the Committee of the PowerPoint Presentation which had been produced and circulated to all Members prior to the Meeting.

- (a) R/107/25/HH - Single storey front porch, side/rear extension and replacement detached garage, following demolition of existing. Alterations to external materials, including replacement rooftiles, fenestration and rendering - 37 Knightscroft Avenue, Rustington**
-

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

- (b) R/110/25/HH - Loft conversion including hip to gable extension. Alterations to existing porch and fenestration. Demolition of existing rear conservatory and construction of new single storey rear extension - 37 Jubilee Avenue, Rustington**
-

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

- (i) The proposal, by reason of its mass, would be overbearing to the occupiers of Nos. 35 and 39 Jubilee Avenue, and would result in a loss of light and privacy, which would adversely affect their visual amenities and quiet enjoyment.

The Committee also AGREED a Neighbour Notification.

- (c) R/115/25/HH - Removal of the existing conservatory. Single storey side and rear extension. New rooflights and rear dormer - 14 Ruston Park, Rustington**
-

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

- (d) R/118/25/HH - Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of new single storey extension on the same footprint - Jasmine, 9 Pigeonhouse Lane, Rustington**
-

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

- (e) **R/119/25/L - Listed building consent to replace bay window to front elevation - 1 Knightscroft House, Sea Lane, Rustington**

The Committee AGREED to raise no objection to this application.

- (f) **R/104/25/HH - Single storey rear extension - The Paddock, 37 Angmering Lane, Rustington**

The Committee AGREED to raise no objection to this application.

- (g) **R/117/25/HH - Two storey rear and single storey side extensions - 22 Sea Avenue, Rustington**

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

69/25 NON-ADVERTISED APPLICATIONS E.G. CERTIFICATES OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT

- (a) **R/126/25/CLP - Lawful development certificate for the proposed removal of play equipment and replacement of bark with turf - Lamb Inn, 73 The Street, Rustington**

The Committee NOTED this application.

(Prior to consideration of the following item, Councillor Mrs Cooper had declared a prejudicial interest in her capacity as an Arun District Council Member and trained substitute on its Planning Committee)

70/25 LU/93/25/PL - PART DEMOLITION, CONVERSION, REFURBISHMENT AND RE-ELEVATION OF UNITS 5 AND 6 AND CONSTRUCTION OF RETAIL (FOOD AND NON-FOOD), LEISURE AND FOOD AND BEVERAGE UNITS (USE CLASS E), TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING, ACCESS, LOADING AREAS, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED WORKS. THIS APPLICATION IS IN CIL ZONE 2 AND IS CIL LIABLE - UNITS 5-7 WATERSMEAD BUSINESS PARK, NORWAY LANE/WORTHING ROAD, LITTLEHAMPTON

The Clerk reported that she had previously circulated plans in respect of the above application for Members' consideration. She said that the closing date for comments from the Council had been agreed by the local Planning Authority to be 1 August 2025.

Following a detailed discussion the Committee AGREED to submit the following representation in respect of this application:-

'My Council is extremely concerned about the effect that the above application will have on the Shopping Centre in Rustington. The Retail Assessment within the application clearly states that there is likely to be a 6.4% loss of business in the Parish but offers no recompense for this downturn nor any guarantee that retailers within the Centre would not relocate at some point in the future when they suffer from this predicted impact.

It is also very disappointing that no consultation was ever undertaken with the Parish Council or indeed the Rustington Chamber of Trade and Commerce, particularly as the site is only approximately 1.8 miles from the centre of Rustington Village, only 0.5 of a mile more than the distance from the site to Littlehampton Town Centre.

At the present time, Rustington is very lucky to still have an attractive and reasonably thriving Shopping Centre although, as mentioned above, a number of the existing traders are suffering from increased costs as a result of higher business rates and national increases in Staffing costs.

If the Parish Council and/or Chamber of Trade and of Commerce had of been consulted, we would have been able to advise that many traders are just surviving and even a minimum loss of 6.4% could cause them to reach breaking point causing a severe impact. There is no evidence that this loss of trade can be absorbed without severe harm.

Clearly, with Rustington being demographically one of the Villages with the oldest population in the Country we need to ensure these residents are served by a sustainable centre. Indeed, the income exceeds that of Littlehampton and therefore should have greater consideration.

There appear to be three units housing clothing and footwear plus one containing health and beauty/variety goods within the proposed Retail Park, all of which are well represented in the Village - the developer admitting a 7% effect on these lines of business. The additional two food stores proposed would also significantly affect the footfall at Sainsburys (11% loss) and Waitrose (4% loss). The latter being extremely worrying as it is the anchor store within the Village Centre.

My Council would, therefore, request that should approval be given to this application, which lies outside of the Parish, then Rustington be recompensed by at least £250,000.00 per annum for a five-year period. It is felt that this is a realistic sum taking account of the developer's figures of a 6.4% loss on a total turnover of £38M, which, in my Council's view is significantly under-estimated.

The aforementioned financial contribution would most certainly support Rustington in boosting the trade and consumer experience, thereby helping to mitigate the negative effect of the introduction of a comprehensive range of retail units trading in close proximity to its Retail Shopping Centre. My Council certainly believes that Rustington should receive at least equal or greater mitigation than Littlehampton. It should be remembered that the Parish Council was awarded Section 106 Funding (£140,000.00) from the Manor Retail Park Development in Angmering (A/125/13), and the cumulative impact was far less severe on Rustington than the proposed Retail Park.

This Council would also urge the District Council to insist that all of the Units on the proposed site must be in excess of 18,000 square feet in size to discourage movement of smaller independent traders when faced with reduced income. We agree that there should also be a condition to prevent future subdivision as mentioned in Paragraph 6.77 of the Retail Assessment.

This application expects to draw 70% of its trade from Rustington and Littlehampton.

In Section 6.43 the Retail Assessment expects greater levels of diversion from Chichester and Worthing. My Council believe that not to be the case due to the distances involved and the presence of high street banks which is a massive draw to both those Centres. Rustington will shortly have none and the local demographics demand a need for face-to-face banking. Arun has one of the highest online fraud reports in the County, and many residents do not feel safe online. This is borne out by the evidence that only 33% of residents in Rustington shop for clothes online.

It is not an accident that our shopping area is attractive, the Parish Council spends in the region of £100,000.00 annually to ensure the Village remains a draw from the outlying area.

In closing, my Council would urge you to give reasoned consideration to Rustington and the residents we support when deliberating and making a final decision on this application.'

71/25

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL - PLANNING COMMITTEE - REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Councillor Warren advised the Committee that the following application had been considered at the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 9 July 2025:-

A/39/23/PL - Demolition of existing structures on site and the erection of an employment park for Use Class E(g)(ii) and B8 floorspace with ancillary offices and structures, delivering the enabling works phase, public right of way diversion, associated access, reptile re-location, drainage and landscaping scheme, followed by the delivery of each development parcel via severable phases. This application is in CIL Zone 4 (zero rated) as other development. - Land west of Brook Lane and South of A259, Angmering

He said that it had been recommended for refusal on the grounds that the proposed pumping solution to possible flooding was unlikely to be either adequate or reliable.

The Committee NOTED this information.

There being no further business, the Meeting concluded at 6.46 pm.

Chairman: Date: