

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

4 March 2020 at 1.00 pm

Present: Councillors Ms Thurston (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), B Blanchard-Cooper, Bower, Charles, Coster, Edwards, Mrs Hamilton, Kelly (Substitute for Councillor Mrs Stainton) Lury, Northeast, Mrs Pendleton, Roberts, Tilbrook (Substitute for Councillor , Bennett), Mrs Worne and Mrs Yeates

Councillors Huntley and Bicknell were also in attendance for all or part of the meeting.

468. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Bennett and Mrs Stainton.

469. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made.

470. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

471. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

The Chairman advised the meeting that there would be a change to the order of the agenda as officers from County Highways were in attendance to answer questions on certain applications and as Item 7 and 9 were related it made sense to consider those consecutively. The running order would therefore be as follows:-

Agenda Item 6 – Planning Application P/58/19/PL  
Agenda Item 10 – Planning Application A/122/19/OUT  
Agenda Item 7 – Planning Application AL/84/19/PL  
Agenda Item 9 – Planning Application AL/91/19/PL  
Agenda Item 8 – Planning Application AL/85/19/PL

The remaining application would then be heard in the order set out in the agenda.

The Chairman also informed the meeting that, due to the length of the agenda, a short adjournment would be called following consideration of Agenda Item 13, and so anyone in attendance to consider subsequent applications could leave and return at 4.30 p.m.

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

472. P/58/19/PL PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED APPLICATION FOR FURTHER INFORMATION REAR OF INGLENOK HOTEL, 253-255 PAGHAM ROAD, PAGHAM

*(Councillor Huntley spoke to this application in his capacity as Ward Member.)*

P/58/19/PL – Erection of 9 No. dwellings with associated access, parking, cycle & refuse storage & landscape design. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan & may affect the setting of a listed building, Rear of Inglenook Hotel, 253-255 Pagham Road, Pagham

This application had been deferred from the meeting held on 6 November 2019 as Members had requested that an independent assessment be undertaken of the highway impacts of the proposals for all highways users, to include consideration of safety issues for all users.

The report on the table presented the conclusions of the Independent Highway Assessment & Road Safety Audit (RSA), which, in summary stated that the application should not be refused as the likely impacts would not be sufficient to justify refusal. However, a series of recommendations for improvements were proposed and a number of key issues highlighted that should be addressed. The report also detailed responses from the applicant, County Highways and the Parish Council, together with additional letters of objections and the officer's response. In order to secure the improvements suggested, relevant conditions had been amended/added as detailed in the report. In addition, the applicant had proposed an alternative footpath around the back of the public house to be accessed by a security code.

The Principal Planning Officer also directed Members to the written report update that had been circulated at the meeting which detailed the following :-

- additional advice received from the Council's independent highway consultant regarding measurements taken of the access road and a summary of the risks to certain groups of people using the access
- response (e) to Further Local Resident Objections which had been omitted from the report in the agenda
- additional local resident objections and relevant officer responses
- additional Informative following advice from West Sussex County Council Fire & Rescue relating to the installation of a fire hydrant within the site
- additional condition relating to the securing of lighting of the alternative footpath route
- additional condition relating to the securing of lighting to improve the safety of the access road

The Council's Independent Highways Consultant was in attendance at the meeting and provided a presentation of his findings. An officer from County Highways also advised the meeting of the issues that were pertinent to their consideration of the matter.

In inviting discussion on the matter, the Chairman reminded the Committee to restrict their comments to the access to the site as that was the only issue on which Members had requested further information be brought back for consideration.

Members participated in a full debate and continued to express serious reservations regarding the safety of all users with regard to the shared access for both pedestrians and vehicles. Refuse lorries and larger delivery vehicles using the access were of particular concern as there was not a clear sight line due to bends in the road. Views were expressed that the access to and egress from the access could be problematic on occasion due to the parking on Pagham Road and the location of the nearby bus stop. It was felt that the mitigation measures that were being proposed were not adequate to ensure the safety of all users.

Member comment was made that the proposal was a justified use of the land but that the access was unacceptable. It was suggested that the developer should negotiate the use of a ransom strip to improve the situation and advice was given that officers had recommended the developer have conversations with the relevant party to that effect.

The Committee centred some discussion around the measurements of the access for both vehicles and pedestrians, which was felt to not be wide enough. In addition, the shared surface could lead to people believing they could walk along its length in safety but, with the blind bend, that might not necessarily be the case. A further view was expressed that there was a real potential for crime and that should be designed out of the development.

The Principal Planning Officer and the County Highways Officer reiterated that no evidence had been presented by way of the RSA to support a refusal of the application on safety grounds

In the course of debate, matters were raised relating to the location of the static caravans; Manual for Streets; gated access and requirement for key pad; and potential for the general public to use the footpath rather than just residents of the development. These points were addressed by officers at the meeting.

The Group Head of Planning reiterated, as advised at the previous meeting, that the proposals were not ideal but County Highways and an independent traffic consultant had provided advice with regard to the safety of the access and both had concluded that it was not so unsafe as to refuse planning permission. In terms of the existing use, the assessment was not against its current use but was against how it could be used without the benefit of planning permission. A number of comments had been made that the access was not as safe as it could be – that was not a test in planning terms, rather, the correct test was to assess whether the access was so unsafe as to refuse the application.

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

In turning to the vote, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and, as indicated by the debate, discussed reasons for refusal. The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposals will introduce a form of development that will result in significant conflicts between highway users to the detriment of highway safety. It will result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, not result in pedestrian priority or a safe and secure development contrary to policies T SP1, D DM1 and Q SP1 of the Arun Local Plan and policies within the NPPF.

473. A/122/19/OUT LAND OFF ARUNDEL ROAD, ANGMERING BN16 4ET

A/122/19/OUT – Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of up to 160 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage systems (SuDs), vehicular access point from Arundel Road, together with up to 1,393 square metres (15,000 square feet) of B1/B2 units with associated parking provision and vehicular access point from Arundel Road and land made available for expansion of current sports pitch provision (following the demolition of existing commercial units and one bungalow) (re-submission following A/36/18/OUT). This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, Land off Arundel Road, Angmering

The Committee received a comprehensive report and presentation from the Principal Strategic Planner on the detail of the proposal, together with a written report update which was circulated at the meeting setting out the following:-

- Triggers for S106 contributions relating to Primary, Secondary and Sixth Form Education, together with the triggers for the Library, Fire and Rescue and the Transport contributions
- Requirement for the Council to provide a footpath connection from Palmer Road Recreation Ground to the Public Right of Way 2176 to be removed from the S106 Agreement
- Reference within the S106 Agreement of a contribution towards the implementation of a cycle route along the “Arundel Road Corridor”.
- Information relating to an Appraisal of Agricultural Land Quality, which included a Soil Resources Plan, and which had been submitted since the agenda had been uploaded to the Council’s website.
- Additional condition relating to the occupiers of the existing commercial units being given the opportunity to take up the new commercial floorspace provided if they so wished.
- An additional representation from a resident of Littlehampton.
- Officer’s response, including an additional condition relating to the soil handling measures.

In discussing the matter, a concern was raised regarding traffic issues and the County Highways Officer in attendance was able to address the matters raised.

A further concern was expressed relating to the S106 contribution for the NHS. This was based around the involvement of the CCG (Coastal Commissioning Group) in health care provision in Littlehampton when funding had not been utilised and two surgeries had now closed. The Principal Strategic Planner was able to give a reassurance that the CCG had confirmed exactly what the contribution would be going towards, i.e. Willow Green Surgery or Coppice Surgery and the proposed Health Hub in Littlehampton. He was able to advise that the CCG was working more closely with the Council than in the past and was supportive of joint working.

Following comment around the employment site and the 20m green buffer zone and responses from the Principal Strategic Planner, the Committee expressed support for the development and

RESOLVED

That the Group Head of Planning be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, to grant planning permission as detailed in the report and the officer report update and

- a) If the grant is on or before 31 March 2020, subject to a Section 106 Agreement, the terms of which are substantially in accordance with those set out in the revised Heads of Terms circulated at the meeting, with any minor amendments authorised by the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman; or
- b) If the grant is on or after 1 April 2020, subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payable.

474. AL/84/19/PL ALDINGBOURNE PARK, HOOK LANE, ALDINGBOURNE PO20 3YR

AL/84/19/PL – Application for removal of conditions 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 imposed on planning reference AL/93/86 relating to timescale, number of caravans, electric lines, site licence & hedges, Aldingbourne Park, Hook Lane, Aldingbourne

Having received a report on the matter, Members were supportive of the proposal but did express reservations with regard to the condition relating to the removal of the existing boundary hedges, even though the applicant had stated that was not the intention. It was therefore agreed that conditions 1, 2, 3 & 4 could be removed and condition 5 would be amended to ensure retention of the boundary hedge.

The Committee then

RESOLVED

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

That removal of conditions 1, 2, 3 & 4 be agreed and condition 5 be amended to read:-

No hedgerow currently growing on the Hook Lane frontage of both Beechfield and Aldingbourne Parks shall be damaged, uprooted, felled, topped or lopped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any hedgerow removed without such consent or which becomes severely damaged or seriously diseased or dying in the future shall be replaced with a hedgerow of such size and species as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority to ensure boundary landscaping is retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the retention of existing screening vegetation important to the visual amenity of the streetscene in accordance with policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

475. AL/91/19/PL BEECHFIELD PARK, HOOK LANE, ALDINGBOURNE PO20 3YR

AL/91/19/PL – Removal of conditions 2, 3, 4 & 5 following AL/95/86 relating to number of caravans on site, electric service lines, no works constituting development required by the condition of a site licence & existing boundary hedges retained in current form, Beechfield Park, Hook Lane, Aldingbourne

Having received a report on the matter, Members were supportive of the proposal but did express reservations with regard to the condition relating to the removal of the existing boundary hedges, even though the applicant had stated that was not the intention. It was therefore agreed that conditions 2, 3 & 4 could be removed and condition 5 would be amended to ensure retention of the boundary hedge.

The Committee then

RESOLVED

That removal of conditions 2, 3 & 4 be agreed and condition 5 be amended to read:-

No hedgerow currently growing on the Hook Lane frontage of both Beechfield and Aldingbourne Parks shall be damaged, uprooted, felled, topped or lopped without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any hedgerow removed without such consent or which becomes severely damaged or seriously diseased or dying in the future shall be replaced with a hedgerow of such size and species as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority to ensure boundary landscaping is retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure the retention of existing screening vegetation important to the visual amenity of the streetscene in accordance with policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

476. AL/85/19/PL ALDINGBOURNE NURSERIES, CHURCH ROAD, ALDINGBOURNE PO20 3TU

AL/85/19/PL – Retention of shop used only by students of One School Global, their parents and friends of One School Global, who are registered to use the shop with no sale or display to visiting member of the public (sui generis use). This is a departure from the Development Plan, Aldingbourne Nurseries, Church Road, Aldingbourne

Having received a report on the matter, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

477. BN/66/19/PL LAND OFF CANAL MEWS, BARNHAM PO22 0DP

BN/66/19/PL – Erection of 2 No. dwellings, Land off Canal Mews, Barnham

In presenting this report, the Principal Planning Officer provided a verbal update detailing that Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council had resubmitted its previous objection despite the reduction in the number of proposed dwellings from 3 to 2 and that 3 further letters of objection had been received stating that

- Previous comments to this application still applied;
- The plan to re-route the sewage pipe/pipes was likely to cause further problems to existing residents; and
- Plans as submitted included the land which was not in the applicant's ownership

As the consultation process did not expire until 19 March 2020, it was proposed that the decision be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, to make after that date.

The Principal Planner confirmed that Southern Water and the Council's own Engineering Team had no objections with regard to foul water drainage, subject to standard conditions. The relevant pipe could be diverted – no condition had been included in the recommendation as permission would have to be obtained from Southern Water before any work could commence.

Members raised issues relating to amenity space; and size of the gardens within the proposed development, which were addressed by the Principal Planning Officer.

Following consideration, the Committee

RESOLVED

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the decision be delegated to the Group Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, following expiry of the consultation period after 19 March 2020.

478. BN/121/19/PL SWALLOWFIELD, EASTERGATE LANE, EASTERGATE PO20 3SJ

BN/121/19/PL – Removal of redundant polytunnel & construction of 4 bedroom detached chalet bungalow with new vehicular entrance & relocation of Nursery parking area. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, Swallowfield, Eastergate Lane, Eastergate

Having received a report on the matter, and following a brief discussion by Members, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

479. BR/243/19/PL 130 LONGFORD ROAD, BOGNOR REGIS PO2 1AF

BR/243/19/PL – Change of use of house in multiple occupation to form 2 No. self-contained flats with a rear extension to form bathrooms at ground and first floors, and a single storey pitch roof and side extension to form a studio flat, 130 Longford Road, Bognor Regis

In presenting this report, the Principal Planner emphasised that this scheme was a reduction from a 5 unit scheme to a 3 unit scheme with a resultant reduction in bed spaces. The change from an HMO (House in Multiple Occupation) was generally supported, although some concerns were raised with regard to the lack of parking in the immediate vicinity. The Group Head of Planning confirmed that this was probably the most sustainable location in the District where a shortage of parking spaces within the development should be a necessity.

Having considered the matter, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report.

The Chairman then called a half hour adjournment to the meeting.



480. CM/64/19/PL LANGFORD, HORSEMERE GREEN LANE, CLIMPING BN17 5QZ

CM/64/19/PL – Residential development comprising 2 x 3 bedroom bungalows, 2 x 3 bedroom houses, 2 x 2 bedroom houses, 3 x 4 bedroom houses along with access and parking following demolition of existing dwelling. This is a Departure from the Development Plan, Langford, Horsemere Green Lane, Climping

In presenting this report, the Planning Team Leader also directed Members to the officer's written report update which had been circulated at the meeting and which set out the following:-

- Clarification of points relating to car parking; change of one property from bungalow to chalet style property; reference to Apple Tree Road should be Apple Tree Walk; and Policy QE DM4 was relevant to determination of the application
- Amended plans were detailed and condition amended accordingly
- No objection consultation response received from Southern Water
- 2 further objections received advising on the absence of street lights in the lane
- Traffic issues had been addressed in the officer report
- Conditions – amendment to conditions and additional conditions detailed
- Unilateral Undertaking/Footpath – the provision of a footpath from the entrance of the site to meet up with the entrance to Apple Tree Walk to the east had been offered by the applicant in the form of a now completed Local Unilateral Undertaking. This had secured £10,000 in funding and the recommendation had been updated to “Approve with a S106”.

Members participated in some debate on the matter and serious concerns were raised that this and forthcoming development in the immediate locality would have a severe detrimental impact on Horsemere Green Lane due to the potential for a significant increase in traffic movements. Although the contribution to the footpath by way of this development was welcomed, the view was expressed that a footpath along the entire length of Horsemere Green Lane was required – this point was reiterated by several Members and a view expressed that the lack of a footpath was unacceptable and dangerous.

Comment was made regarding the density of the development and a response given by the Planning Team Leader. Further remarks were made that it was unfortunate that the development along the Lane was piecemeal rather than providing a cohesive form in the area and was there a Design Plan? It was confirmed by the Planning Team Leader that there was no Design Plan – there were strategic allocations which could promote good design and planning principles but that did not apply to this development.

On the issue of drainage being raised, Members were informed that that was covered by pre commencement conditions whereby the applicant was required to provide details for consideration by the Council's Engineers to ensure suitable drainage

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

would be provided. The Engineering Services Manager provided more detailed advice to assure Members that drainage matters would be satisfactorily addressed.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update.

481. CM/65/19/PL ATHERINGTON LODGE, CLIMPING STREET, CLIMPING BN17 5RN

CM/65/19/PL – Demolition of existing dwelling & construction of new dwelling on existing footprint of original & retaining the same vernacular style (Resubmission of CM/33/19/PL) Departure from the Development Plan, Atherington Lodge, Climping Street, Climping

The Planning Team Leader presented the report, together with the officer's written report update circulated at the meeting which detailed the consultation response from the Council's Engineers and resultant additional informative relating to flooding. The Engineering Services was in attendance and provided clarification on the flooding issues in the locality.

The debate highlighted some Members' serious concerns in respect of the application, particularly as it was felt the design was out of character with this part of Climping and that the large dormer windows would create unacceptable overlooking. As the dwelling was partly constructed the question was asked as to how it could be checked that the floor levels adhered to condition 2 and an officer response was provided that, if asked, it could be investigated to ensure compliance with the condition.

Officers addressed the issues raised and confirmed that the first floor space was broadly similar in appearance to previously approved CM/3/18/HH. The dormer windows, whilst large, would not cause overlooking as there was a distance of some 40m to the neighbouring property and was at an oblique angle. In addition, dormer windows had been included in the previous application. An explanation was provided as to why the original building had been demolished and building recommenced and why the application was now before the Committee as a retrospective application. Members were advised that insufficient footings had been provided to support the conversion of the roof space, which had resulted in demolition of the dwelling.

Having considered the matter, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update.

482. EP/168/19/PL 4 BEECHLANDS COTTAGES AND LAND ADJACENT, BEECHLANDS CLOSE, EAST PRESTON BN16 1JT

EP/168/19/PL – 1 No. dwelling & alterations to roof of existing dwelling (4 Beechlands Cottages), the provision of new dormer to front elevation of Beechlands Cottages and land adjacent, Beechlands Close, East Preston

In presenting this report, the Planning Team Leader reminded the Committee that planning permission had been granted in May 2017 for an identical development under planning application EP/41/17/PL.

On discussing the matter, comment was made that the Council had recently adopted its own parking standards and this proposal did not adhere to that. There were problems already in the locality with regard to parking. A view was expressed that the side entrance to the dwelling was not suitable and that the side window would overlook the neighbouring bungalow. Officer advice was given that it was a bedroom window and would be obscure glazed. Further Member comment stated that, as the proposal was at the end of a terrace, the design needed to be more symmetrical and, again, did not adhere to the Council's own emerging Design Guide.

On being put to the vote, the Committee did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and it was duly proposed and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of the Council's recently adopted Parking Standards DPD (Development Plan Document) and that the design was not acceptable.

The Group Head of Planning advised that he did not think there was any prospect of defending an appeal on those grounds. However, a Member view was voiced that the Committee should stand behind its own Parking Standards and design principles and the Committee therefore

RESOLVED

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposed dwelling by virtue of its poor design and lack of sufficient car parking will result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality and areas highway safety contrary to policies D SP1, D DM1, T SP1 of the Arun Local Plan, Arun District Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document and policy 1 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan January 2020..

483. FG/135/19/PL SILO AT FORMER MCINTYRE NURSERY, LITTLEHAMPTON ROAD, FERRING BN12 6PG

FG/135/19/PL – Demolition of a silo & erection of an office building (B1(a) Business), 6 No. parking spaces for office workers & erection of boundary fencing, Silo at Former McIntyre Nursery, Littlehampton Road, Ferring

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

Having received the detail of the proposal from the Planning Team Leader, Members participated in a full debate. In opening the debate, comment was made that the existing silo was preferable to the building that was being proposed to replace it and, in addition, the development would impinge on the Angmering/Worthing Gap which had now been adopted.

Members were reminded that existing planning permission FG/56/18/PL had been approved in November 2018 to convert the existing silo to office space and was still valid therefore this proposal would be difficult to refuse due to its slight increase in footprint. However, views were expressed that the proposed development was obtrusive and did not sit well in the setting of Highdown Hill. The design, colour and materials were not suitable.

The Group Head of Planning gave advice that, although the previous permission was for a conversion and this proposal was for a new build, the design was in a similar style to be built on the same plot for the same use. With reference to the Angmering/Worthing Gap, there was no requirement to enhance the quality of the gap as it was not a land quality policy. Furthermore, the integration of the gap was not significant. In response to Members' comments with regard to disliking the design, he also pointed out that that was subjective and that was why it would be difficult to go back to policies.

In order to alleviate Members' reservations with regard to the design, the Planning Team Leader suggested that an additional condition could be included to require the applicant to submit details of materials, finishes, colours and textures to the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of any works.

The Committee voted unanimously on that course of action and asked that the application be brought back to enable Members to consider the materials, etc as they wished to see the effect of the proposal softened.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be deferred to enable the applicant to submit details of materials, finishes, colours and textures to the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of any works.

484. F/11/19/PL WICKS FARM, FORD LANE, FORD BN18 0DF

F/11/19/PL – Construction of agricultural barn with flexible storage use (B8 Use Class) with ancillary office space, Wicks Farm, Ford Lane, Ford

The Planning Team Leader presented this report, together with the officer's written report update detailing amendment to condition 5 to better protect Poplar trees on the site and an additional informative regarding safe evacuation in the event of fire.

Following consideration, the Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and officer report update.

485. F/18/19/PL LAND ADJACENT TO 3 WICKS FARM COTTAGES, FORD LANE, FORD BN18 0DQ

F/18/19/PL – 1 No. new dwelling. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan, Land adjacent to 3 Wicks Farm Cottages, Ford Lane, Ford

In presenting the detail of this report, the Planning Team Leader also advised the Committee by way of a verbal report that:-

- The Council's Tree Officer had originally objected to the proposal. He was re-consulted and, subject to a pre-commencement condition, he was now satisfied with the proposal as it stood.

In response to a Member comment, it was confirmed that there was no defined gap between Yapton and Ford.

The Committee then

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report, subject to the addition of a pre-commencement condition to read as follows:-

Prior to the commencement of development the applicants will need to employ the services of an Arboricultural Consultant to carry out a tree survey exercise and then prepare an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) which must be inclusive of; a 'Tree Survey Schedule', a 'Root Protection Area (RPA) Schedule' and a 'Tree Constraints Plan' - with the trees accurately plotted on same.

In the event that a RPA of any tree which is proposed for retention overlaps the development then BS5837:2012 requires that an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) is submitted and also most importantly a Tree Protection Plan - to describe and illustrate the mitigation measures which are to be employed to ensure that the trees survive without detriment to their vigour and vitality and are given adequate protection both above and below ground.

All documents above including the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement & Tree Protection Plan as required shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

Local Planning Authority and the works carried out in accordance with approved details.

486. K/32/19/PL LITTLE DEERSWOOD, GORSE AVENUE, KINGSTON GORSE BN16 1SF

K/32/19/PL – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 1 x 3 storey dwelling with swimming pool and associated amenity space and parking

The Planning Team Leader presented this report and directed Members to the officer's written report update circulated at the meeting which set out the detail of an additional letter of objection and additional information received from the agent regarding materials, which had resulted in a materials condition being attached to any approval.

The Committee

RESOLVED

That the application be approved as detailed in the report and the officer report update.

487. R/268/19/PL 6 MANOR ROAD, RUSTINGTON BN16 3QT

R/268/19/PL – Demolition of existing garage & store on existing dwelling & erection of 1 No. 4 bed chalet style dwelling (re-submission of planning ref R/72/19/PL), 6 Manor Road, Rustington

The Committee received the report, together with the officer's written report update which provided information on the following:-

- Revised plans relating to west driveway crossover location; visibility splay; existing (east) driveway to remain as existing; and provision of new bin store provision
- Amended conditions relating to plans and highways
- Additional informative relating to the need for a sprinkler system
- Correction to density to 15 dwellings per hectare

In considering the matter, views were expressed that this was 'garden grabbing' and a concern was raised that approval of this proposal would set a precedent in the area.

In turning to the vote, Members did not accept the officer recommendation to approve and, having been formally proposed and seconded, the Committee

RESOLVED

Subject to approval at the next Development Control Committee meeting

373

Development Control Committee - 4.03.20

That the application be refused for the following reason:-

The proposal will not result in a form of development that will enhance the quality of the environment contrary to policy QE SP1 of the Arun Local Plan.

488. LIST OF APPEALS

The Committee received and noted the appeals that had been received.

(The meeting concluded at 7.51 pm)