

**KINGSTON PARISH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes: of the Meeting held on 17 July, 2025 commencing at 7.52 pm in Our Lady Star of the Sea Hall, Vermont Drive, East Preston.

Present: Councillors Andrew (Chairman), Buckenham and Masson.
Val Knight (Clerk).

31/25 **Welcome and Safety Procedures** – The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained safety procedures.

32/25 **Apologies** – Cllrs Marr and Wetherell.

33/25 **Declaration of Interests** - Further to declarations held in the Register of Members Interests, in the interest of openness, Cllr Masson declared membership of Kingston Gorse Estate.

34/25 **Public Opportunity** – No members of the public were present.

35/25 **Minutes** of the meeting held on the 15 May, 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman. There were no matters arising.

36/25 **Planning Applications** -

a) **Consideration** of current applications:

K/12/25/HH Tilford, Golden Acre - Extension to detached garage and rear extension to main house. Widen existing crossover and install new drop kerb.

Comment: No objection

b) **Actions** by the Clerk between meetings under delegated powers (in liaison with Members) were noted:

The following comments had been submitted to District:

K/11/25/DOV Land north-east of Kingston Lane - Application to enter into a Deed of Variation to modify Paragraph 2.8(a), Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Section 106 dated 4th July 2024 (linked to K/46/23/PL) in relation to the affordable housing provision. Comment: Council objects to the deed of variation (DOV) being approved:

1. The proposed DOV deals with the Section 106 agreement re K/46/23/PL where it relates to the provision of Affordable Housing (14 dwellings), Council stresses the importance for the area of Affordable Housing being actually built when it is part of an approved Development scheme rather than a commuted sum being paid in lieu of delivery.

2. The decision to approve the development by the Arun Planning Committee was carried 6 votes to 5. Affordable housing provision was given weight when making this decision. Would the decision have still been to approve had the affordable housing element been approved? Given the importance of this Council asks it be referred to the Planning Committee for consideration.

3. Should the planning permission itself be overturned as the conditions of the original Section 106 agreement have not been met?

4. If not as mentioned in point 3, Council feels it is important that the evidence required to overturn the provision of Affordable Housing for a commuted sum is robust and clearly set out so that any Member of the public reading it can clearly understand what is required.

5. Council considers that the proposed wording of the DOV is ‘woolly’ and allows for too much wriggle room on the evidence to be provided and ‘reasonable’ can easily be challenged and argued upon. The DOV should set out a more concrete and non-arguable requirement for evidence. Should it for instance include as an essential part of the evidence required the recommendation from the Three Dragons Report “Have all possible RPs been approached? Applicant to add site to Homes England s106 clearing house service”

Finally, some administrative queries

- should the application be rejected and reapplied for given the apparent errors on a) the application form which says the application is for K/56/22/PL - the application that was refused, and b) the covering letter refers to K/6/25/AOO as ‘the development’. Neither

mention K/46/23/PL the actual approved application for the development that the Section 106 agreement is a part of.

- Please explain how the proposed change to Schedule 2, Part 1, Para 2.8(a) will be interpreted given the refusal for K/6/25/AOO as the process for the First and Second Offers had not been followed. This comment refers to the last para that reads under PROVIDED THAT 'The Owner shall pay to the Council the Affordable Housing Commuted Sum for each of the Affordable Housing Units in relation to which the First and Second Offers have not been accepted within 20 Working Days of the end of the Second Offer Period'

Arising from this: It was agreed to ask for the support of Beccy Cooper MP on the request that any decision on this should be made by the Arun Planning Committee. The local press also to be made aware of this issue. Concerns were also expressed that despite lessons learnt over time, the proposed play area will be at the edge of the development and not the centre so that natural surveillance for child safety is not achieved.

d) **Arun District Council:** Status of Planning Applications were noted:

Undecided: K/12/25/HH re Tilford, Golden Acre, K/11/25/DOV re Land north-east of Kingston Lane

Approved: K/7/25/HH re Driftwood, 32 Coastal Road, K/8/25/HH The Salterns, 8 Coastal Road

Permitted: K/9/25/PD Potato Barn, Kingston Farm, Kingston Lane

Refused: K/6/25/AOO Land north-east of Kingston Lane

37/25 **Kingston Neighbourhood Plan potential review** – The Clerk advised that further quotes had been requested.

38/25 **Biodiversity, Conservation, Green Issues and Coast Protection:**

Ferring Rife: no report available.

Groyne Inspection Report – Still awaited from District. Information on remnants of groynes along the beach had been reported to District as a hazard and District had replied that these would be investigated.

Protection of Nesting Birds – It was noted that the PCC (with Beccy Cooper MP copied in) has been asked for comment on the lack of a proactive response from the Sussex Rural Crime Team when hedge/tree clearance was taking place in a field east of Kingston Lane/south of Newcote Farm. It was further noted that the field has now changed hands and will be restored.

39/25 **Environment Working Group (EWG):**

Drinking Water – Cllr Buckenham raised questions about the contents and levels of concentration in local tap water and could not get an answer from Southern Water's website or helpline. Cllr Buckenham suggested sending a sample of tap water to a laboratory for testing and was asked to come back to committee with more details of the tests available and associated costs. The Clerk had also made a request to Southern Water for information and a response is awaited.

Dog signs – The Clerk advised that District were to deliver some sample signs to her in the next few days Cllr Masson suggested that if they were suitable, they could be used to replace old and damaged signs. It was agreed that this could be done with the approval of the relevant Estate.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.29 pm.

Chairman

Date.....