

PAGHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee Minutes

Tuesday 22nd July 2008

Minutes of a meeting held at the Village Hall, Pagham.

Present: Cllrs. C. Doherty, Vice Chairman (in the Chair), M. Belman, C. Bird, Mrs. D. Hall, and R. Radmall.

In Attendance: Mrs. J. Martin, Locum Clerk. Two members of the public were present.

The meeting opened at 7.04 pm

Declarations of Interest: It is a requirement that all Councillors make a declaration of personal or prejudicial interest either prior to the commencement of a meeting, or at any time in the process of the meeting where such an interest may become apparent.

43.08pl Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs. Mrs. Black, Chairman (unwell), Mrs. D. Burgess and R. Burgess (other commitments). These were **ACCEPTED**.

44.08pl Code of Conduct – Declarations of Personal or Prejudicial Interests

Cllr. Mrs. D. Hall, in her capacity as Chairman of the Arun District Council Development Control Committee, gave the following declaration:

“I will be voting on the matter before me, having regard only to such information as placed before the Parish Council. If I come to consider the matter again at the District Council, further information will be available and I will consider all the information available at that time and I may come to a different decision.”

45.08pl Public Session

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7.06pm to allow members of the public to speak.

Ms H. Mancey of 43 Sea Lane and next-door neighbour, Mr. R. Griffin, of 41 Sea Lane, wished to speak in support of application P/84/08 for 43 Sea Lane (see Min 48.08pl below).

Ms Mancey stated that the access had been used for the last 15 years, and in her view, the proposal would not generate additional traffic or noise. She was not trying to build a second dwelling and thought that most of the proposal could, in any case, be covered by Permitted Development. There were no objections from immediate neighbours at nos. 41 and 45 Sea Lane. The proposal would not affect the street scene, being hidden by mature trees and hedging and was not in the Flood Risk area. All greenery would remain, with the mature sycamore being subject to a TPO. In her opinion, the plans demonstrated good use of land, therefore she asked the Committee to reconsider the recommendation made at its meeting on 8 July 2008 on P/76/08, to object to the application for a Certificate of Lawfulness.

Asked how the current proposal differed from the one subject to Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate in February 2007, Ms Mancey stated that the parking had moved to a more central position, but the footprint was the same size as the previous proposal. The Chairman promised that the Inspector’s Report would be obtained and examined. Mr. Griffin disagreed with an earlier comment from Arun DC that the proposal was unneighbourly. Since the Government was keen to promote high density development, he considered that the building, on 0.1 hectare of land was not unreasonable. The point was, however, made that the character

of areas was also a strong consideration.

Cllr. Radmall referred to the recent application for 35 Sea Lane, stating that the Planning Authority had a prejudice against backland development, which was supported by the Parish Council's adopted Village Design Statement (VDS). It was essential that the Parish Council was consistent in its approach to planning. He described the extensive local consultation which had gone into the production of the Parish Plan and the VDS, the latter of which had been adopted by Arun DC in January 2008. Being so recent, this truly reflected local opinion and current practice at Arun DC. When asked what the Parish Council considered would be acceptable development for properties in Sea Lane, Cllr. Radmall advised that in his opinion, the extension of existing properties and roof additions might be considered sympathetically.

In conclusion, Ms Mancey was advised to examine the Appeal Inspector's report, to address the areas of objection. If she wished to pursue her current plans, it was open to her to lodge a further appeal, should her application be refused by Arun DC. She and Mr. Griffin were thanked for attending the meeting.

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 7.36pm, when Ms Mancey and Mr. Griffin left the meeting.

46.08pl To Receive and Approve the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 8 July 2008.

Three changes were made:

Minute 34.08pl – Cllr. Mrs. Hall was now Chairman of the Development Control Committee.

Minute 38.08pl – P/76/08 – replace “characteristic” with “characterised”.

Minute 42.08pl (ii) – replace Spence with Spencer.

Proposed: Cllr. Mrs. Hall

Seconded: Cllr. Belman

Decision: *Resolved unanimously to Recommend to Parish Council.*

47.08pl Matters Arising from the above Minutes

None.

48.08pl Planning Applications to be Considered

Planning List 26 (Observations by 31 July 2008)

P/79/08

Mr. and Mrs. P. Jarvis,

6 Church Lane, Pagham.

Rear two storey extension.

Recommendation to Arun DC: *Carried unanimously for the extension. To defer comment on the detached outbuilding for “conversion to living accommodation for ancillary family use”, which had been crossed out, although plans provided for consideration. It was AGREED that once the Clerk had clarified what was required, the recommendation be delegated to the Chairman and Vice Chairman, in consultation with the Clerk.*

(NB. The Case Officer, Mrs. A. Gardner, advised on 23 July 2008 that the outbuilding had been withdrawn from the application, being Permitted Development, despite being located within the Flood Risk zone.)

Proposed: Cllr. Mrs. Hall

Seconded: Cllr. Radmall

Resolution: *Carried unanimously.*

Planning List 27 (Observations by 7 August 2008)

P/81/08

Mr. A. Redfern,

24 Honeysuckle Drive, Mill Farm Estate, Pagham.
Georgian style conservatory.

Recommendation to Arun DC: *No objection.*

Proposed: Cllr. Bird
Seconded: Cllr. Mrs. Hall
Resolution: *Carried unanimously.*

P/83/08
Mr. S. Chandler,
22 Nyetimber Crescent, Pagham.
Single storey side extension.

Recommendation to Arun DC: *No objection.*

Proposed: Cllr. Radmall
Seconded: Cllr. Belman
Resolution: *Carried unanimously.*

P/84/08
Mr. Metcalfe and Ms Mancey,
43 Sea Lane, Pagham.
Revised planning application for the erection of 1 no. new bungalow (resubmission of P/112/07).

Minute 45.08pl above refers. The Appeal Decision by Peter Beasley, Planning Inspector dated 23 February 2007 (Ref: APP/C3810/A/2031328) was downloaded from the Planning Inspectorate website and read in full. The Inspector's conclusion was that the appeal proposals conflicted with current advice in PPS7 concerning the need to ensure that new housing was well integrated with, and complemented neighbouring buildings and the local area generally. The proposal also conflicted with policies DEV1, CH1 and LOC1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 – 2016, concerning the need to secure high quality development; to ensure that new development maintained and, where possible, enhanced the character, distinctiveness and sense of place of the immediate area; and to ensure that the impact of infill development within the built-up area boundary was acceptable. Likewise, the proposal conflicted with policies GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 requiring development to achieve a high standard of layout and design, to respond positively to the characteristics of the local area, and to avoid adverse impact on the adjoining occupiers. The appeal was dismissed.

Recommendation to Arun DC: *Objection.*

Although it was acknowledged that this plot was one of the larger ones in Sea Lane, there had been a number of proposals seeking consent for the development of additional units in rear gardens of the mature properties along the lane's north-east flank, all of which had failed. Notwithstanding the fact that there is a substantial rear garden to this property, as was also the case with 35 Sea Lane, Members felt that a consistent policy had been founded in the matter of backland development proposals, which sought to establish additional units. Members therefore reiterate Pagham Parish Council's objection on 25 April 2008 to the development at 35 Sea Lane.

Indeed, the Planning Inspector's comments relating to an earlier proposal for this site lends weight to the subsequent stance taken by the Planning Authority. His main thrust was the safeguarding of the established character of that part of Sea Lane. The Parish Plan 2004 and Village Design Statement 2007 (adopted January 2008) clearly reinforces that view, having been derived from extensive public consultation dating from 2003. Sea Lane is characteristic on its south east flank by mainly 1960s chalet developments with mature frontages and substantial rear gardens. Many of these properties have recently been extended and include significant roof additions. This appears to be an accepted trend for providing enhanced accommodation in planning terms. However, the provision of

additional units by way of back land development was viewed by Members as a worrying trend and was likely to establish an undesirable precedent. Local input to the Parish Plan and VDS indicates a strong prejudice against cramped, un-neighbourly and out of character development. This reinforces Local Plan Policies Gen 7 (ii), (iv), (vi).

Whilst Members recognise that this is not an application for a bungalow, the proposal is for a building of similar size. The Planning Authority delivered policy comment was firm and unequivocal: "The erection of one bungalow on this site will represent an unacceptable form of backland development which will be unneighbourly to surrounding properties by reason of noise and disturbance and out of character with the immediate area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CHI and DEVI of the West Sussex Structure Plan and policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan."

Members concluded that this submission was little changed from the original and therefore the concerns of the Planners and Planning Inspectorate had not been addressed.

Proposed: Cllr. Bird

Seconded: Cllr. Radmall

Resolution: *Carried unanimously.*

49.08pl To Review Decisions made by Arun DC

The Chairman updated Members on planning applications previously considered by the Committee and now decided by Arun DC (Lists 26 and 27 – Appendix A).

50.08pl Licensing Applications and Requests for Extension of Time (Village Hall)

None.

51.08pl Clerk's Report and Correspondence

- (i) WSCC: Sefter Road, Pagham – Temporary Closure Order 2008 – Notices were posted on 10 July 2008 stating that from 15 July, for a period of approximately five weeks, Sefter Road would be closed to traffic, although pedestrian access would be maintained. This was to enable electricity cables to be laid under the carriageway. Enquiries could be made on 01243 642105.
- (ii) Arun DC: Notice of Intention under the Electronic Communications Code Regulations 2003 – Bognor Regis Football Club, Nyewood lane, Bognor Regis - to utilise Permitted Development Rights for the installation of 2 no. new panel antenna at a height of 8m to base on the existing Vodaphone lattice tower and the installation of 2 no. Airwave LN cabinets, each 1100 x 900 x 2476mm and ancillary ground base equipment.
- (iii) Arun DC: List of Proposed Decisions to be taken by Individual Cabinet Members on 17 July 2008 – none for Pagham. List available in office.
- (iv) Arun DC: List of Decisions taken by Individual Cabinet Members on 10 July 2008 – none for Pagham. List available in office.
- (v) WSCC: Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – County Matter Waste Application for On-Farm Agricultural Anaerobic Digestion Plant using Existing Agricultural Trimmings and By-Products at Sefter Farm, Pagham Road, Pagham it was **AGREED** that no objection be made to the proposal. A letter would be sent to WSCC supporting this welcome "green" initiative.
- (vi) WSCC – Joint Western Arun Area Committee (JWAAC) – agenda and papers for meeting on 30 July 2008 at 7pm in the Assembly Hall at Chichester University (Bognor Regis Campus). Cllr. Mrs. Hall would attend. Agenda items concerning Pagham were:

10 – Pagham to East Head Draft Coastal Defence Strategy – pages 7 to 10 of the Environment Agency's summary document of "Planning for the Future"

11 – JWAAC Prioritised Detailed TRO List (June 2008) – Pagham Road, between Canterbury Close and Summer Lane: Double yellow lines to assist poor visibility at junctions due to non-residential parking outside shops. To commence 2009/10.
15 – Sustainable Community Strategy – Feedback on “Your Kind of Place” stated: Pagham – The village community needs to be retained. Environmental laws need to be changed to enable the protection of homes and lives through the upkeep of sea defences. The public toilets near the beach should be retained”.

- (vii) Action in Rural Sussex – Community Planning Networks – letter dated 15 July 2008. It was **AGREED** not to pursue this.
- (viii) 36 West Front Road, Pagham – a letter of complaint had been received, alleging that a rear extension had been completed without consent. This would be investigated.

52.08pl Urgent matters for the Chairman to lay before Members

- (i) Diversion of FP111 a Church Farm – Cllr. Mrs. Hall reported that at tomorrow’s Development Control Committee meeting, application P/35/08 for one bungalow previous application approved under P/51/07 at 31 West Front Road, Pagham, would be considered. The diversion of FP111 at Church Farm was also under consideration.
- (ii) Use of Envelopes – to Clerk was asked to defer from placing Members’ papers in large envelopes in the front office, to save stationery costs. Instead, papers should be put in the front office in Members’ yellow folders for them to collect and the folders re-used.

Date of Next Meeting: Tuesday 5 August 2008.

Closure: The meeting ended at 8.35pm.

Chairman of the Planning Committee:

Date: