

**KINGSTON PARISH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes: of the virtual Meeting held on 21 January, 2021 commencing at 7.35 pm.

Present: Councillors Masson (Chairman), Buckenham, Jolly, Joyce, Kenning, Walker and Wetherell.

01/21 **Apologies** – All members were present.

02/21 **Declaration of Interests** - Further to declarations held in the Register of Members Interests, in the interest of openness, Cllrs Kenning, Masson and Walker declared membership of Kingston Gorse Estate and Cllr Jolly declared membership of West Kingston Residents Association. Cllr Buckenham declared an interest in K/52/20/HH and K/57/20/CLP re Agenda Item 5 due to the proximity to his own dwelling

03/21 **Public Opportunity:** No members of the public were present.

04/21 **Minutes** of the meeting held on the 19 November, 2020 were approved as a correct record. There were no matters arising.

05/21 **Planning Applications:**

a) The following comment was agreed:

K/58/20/HH Moorings, Gorse Avenue - Alterations to side hipped roof to new sussex barn half hipped roof and widen existing front dormer windows, alterations to rear roof elevation from hipped to gable end and addition of matching ground floor bay window to rear
No Objection

b) Committee noted the following comment submitted by the Clerk between meetings in accordance with delegated powers:

Note: Cllr Buckenham declared an interest in K/52/20/HH and K/57/20/CLP due to the proximity to his own dwelling and left the meeting whilst these were considered.

K/52/20/HH Flint Barn, Peak Lane - Single storey front extension, first floor front/side extension, first floor rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a Juliette balcony.

No objection providing the case officer takes the following concerns in to account:

- The plot of Flint Barn has been increased to include an additional area at its north east point. This is an area not previously within the plot, that forms part of Peak Lane (and BOAT 3623). It allows a right of way to others. For instance, for neighbouring properties to tend their boundary and for vehicles to use as part of a turning point. It should not be enclosed so that this right of way may continue.
- The plans have a discrepancy: the first floor and roof plans show one dormer with two skylights that does not match the north elevation which shows two separate dormers.

K/57/20/CLP Flint Barn, Peak Lane - Certificate of lawful development for the proposed change of use from hobby room to 1 No dwelling.

OBJECTION – for the following reasons

- This should not be allowed to create a separate dwelling.
- Allowing a hobby room to become a fully habitable space with full services because of its location on the plot and future usage will adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- It is out of keeping with the existing density of dwellings in this area of countryside.
- Council is also concerned that the plot of Flint Barn has been increased to include an additional area at its north east point. This is an area not previously within the plot that forms part of Peak Lane (and BOAT 3623). It allows a right of way to others. For instance, for neighbouring properties to tend their boundary and for vehicles to use as part of a turning point. It should not be enclosed so that this right of way may continue.
- If the Planning Officer is minded to approve this application it should be for ancillary use only to the main dwelling.

K/54/20/PL Land East of Kingston House, Kingston Lane - Single storey 4 bed dwelling & stable block (resubmission following K/16/19/PL).

OBJECTION (Summary) - Council objected to the previous application for this site K/16/19/PL and does not consider that any of the proposed changes in this resubmission mitigate our original objection. The proposed four-bedroom dwelling has not been significantly relocated and the plans now include the additional building of a stable block with the curtilage of the dwelling being extended to encompass a further area of countryside and agriculture that sits within the Gap Between Settlements (East Preston to Ferring). Kingston Parish Council therefore re-iterates its previous objections. Furthermore, regarding the refusal of K/16/19/PL Council fully supports the reasons for refusal by Arun District Council and the Planning Inspector on appeal and consider that these are still relevant to this revised application K/54/20/PL

K/55/20/PL 57 Coastal Road - Demolition & erection of 1 No. dwelling.

OBJECTION - for the following reasons:

- It is an overdevelopment of the site
- Due to its design, increase in bulk and scale and its position across the plot, it is visually more intrusive than the existing dwelling and will overly and adversely dominate the street scene.
- It will be overbearing on the neighbouring properties given its overall height and increase in footprint. The height should not exceed the ridge height of the existing dwelling (14.89)
- The build line should not extend further south than the existing. This will be detrimental to the neighbouring property and to the 'street scene' as viewed from the West Kingston Greensward. Council considers that properties along Coastal Road and the Greensward effectively have a double frontage.
- It is out of character to the design of other houses in the vicinity.
- It is intrusive to neighbouring properties affecting their natural light and privacy.
- It is contrary to the Kingston Parish Neighbourhood Plan policy KPNP 7 re Design & Development

06/21 **Arun District Council**

Development Control Committee – The following decisions/status was noted:

Approved: K/40/20/HH Panorama, Golden Acre, K/44/20/HH and K/45/20/L Kingston Manor, Kingston Lane, K/46/20/HH 105 Golden Avenue, K/48/20/HH Innisfree, Golden Acre and K/50/20/HH 43 Coastal Road.

07/21 **Biodiversity, Conservation, Green Issues and Coast Protection:**

Ferring Rife (condition) – Cllr Joyce reported that the Rife appeared to be in good order and flowing freely.

Sea Defences – Members expressed their continuing concerns about the condition of the sea defences. It was agreed to review this again once the works identified by District in their recent inspection report had been completed.

Rampion Wind Farm 2 – It was agreed to make the following comments on the informal consultation currently being carried out by Rampion.

Council has these initial concerns:

Visual Impact: There will be an extremely detrimental visual effect on the seascape given:

- Rampion 2 is to be sited only 8.1 miles from the shoreline - this is far too close.
- the much larger sized turbines (325m – taller than the Eiffel Tower!) will have a greater visual impact than Rampion 1, during the day and when lit at night.
- the combined and extended span of Rampion 1 and 2 will affect the seascape of an extensive part of the Sussex coastline – potentially from Newhaven to Selsey. This will affect the views for residents and tourists as well as views from iconic sites such as Arundel Castle and the South Downs National Park.

Environmental Impact:

- the effect of turbines on birds as their safe flight corridors will be lost
- the disturbance of the seabed that will impact on the plants and sea creatures

- the effect on the countryside and its wildlife by laying cables from Climping to Bolney.

Economic Impact: how will the scheme affect the local economy including tourism and fishing?

Location: Whilst Council fully supports the need to bring on stream more renewable energy, Wind Farms need to be located with sensitivity to the amenity and landscape of the local area. Are there other sites around the coast where the turbines can be set much further out to sea to reduce the visual impact such as at Dogger Bank in the North Sea?

These comments would be submitted in an article to the All About Magazine and circulated to all parishes in Arun with a copy to the parish's District Councillors and County Councillor and to Sir Peter Bottomley MP.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.20 pm.

Chairman

Date.....