

**1 Mulberry Lodge
Cudlow Garden
Rustington BN16 2RN**

Dear Sir

PLANNING APPLICATION R/84/26/PL 55-57 SEA LANE, RUSTINGTON

It is noted that your Environmental Health Dept has made comment on this application and although recommendations have been made for Conditions that control the detailed design and installation of the proposed air handling system, it would appear that their consultation of the document that they refer to has not been adequately considered or correctly implemented.

The EH Dept recommends that the applicants refer to the EMAQ document while finalising their design and installation criteria. Can your EH Dept verify and explain the following shortcomings in their response to the application and whether they carried out an on-site risk assessment and appraisal of this application?

- Under the Minimum Requirements for Odour Control section, the objectives stated are that the planning conditions restricting the impact of odour shall be designed to prevent harm to the amenity. Can this be adequately demonstrated and defended should action under section 79 or 82 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 be undertaken by either the local residents or indeed, the Council if the installation proves to be inadequate?
- Under the section 'Best Practice for Design and Operation of Commercial Kitchen Ventilation Systems : Performance Requirements – looking at the discharge stack section, (page 6) the following criteria are stated :
- The discharge stack shall: 1 Discharge the extracted air not less than 1m above the roof ridge of any building within 15m of the vent serving the commercial kitchen. Number 31 Cudlow Avenue is within 15m of the proposed vent (a two storey house) and the rear terrace of Number 51 Sea Lane is only 1.5m horizontally from the proposed discharge point AND at the same level as the proposed discharge point – this cannot be considered compliant and adequate to ensure that correct dispersal and hence statutory nuisance is not caused, can it?
- If a site visit had been carried, it should have been noted that there are five dormers and 21 opening windows on the rear of the Sea Lane building, across multiple residential properties with many bedroom windows opening on to the shared courtyard space, the majority of which will be ABOVE the discharge level. Is this appropriate to ensure that statutory nuisance has been adequately considered in the EH response to this Planning application?
- Why has the alternative of a high level ridge vent not been explored with the applicants? This would have avoided all the issues of adjacent opening windows, dormers and potential logging of smells and extracted air becoming 'trapped' by the higher surrounding buildings?

In conclusion, I hope that you will very critically review the application and recommend that it is REFUSED in its current form due to totally inadequate provision for the maintenance and enhancement of the amenity of the local area and severely detriment effects to more than 30 surrounding residential properties immediately adjacent to the site.

Yours faithfully

John Sykes

Please note my working days are Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday.

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd

Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to

<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



Our priorities...

 Improving the wellbeing of Arun	 Delivering the right homes in the right places	 Supporting our environment to support us	 Fulfilling Arun's economic potential	 
--	---	---	--	---

From: JOHN SYKES [REDACTED]

Sent: 02 August 2026 18:34

To: Environmental Health <environmental.health@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: Cllr. Lynne Edwards <cllr.lynne.edwards@arun.gov.uk>; Cllr. Lesley-Anne Lloyd <Cllr.Lesley-Anne.Lloyd@arun.gov.uk>; Cllr. Peggy Partridge <Cllr.Peggy.Partridge@arun.gov.uk>; [REDACTED]

Subject: R/84/26/PL - 55-57 Sea Lane, Rustington

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Good morning

Please find a letter attached for your review in connection with this application and its consideration for Planning Permission.

I am aware that this is submitted later than the initial consultation period, but as there has been an extension of time requested for consideration of this application, I trust that later submissions of objection can be similarly accommodated.

Regards

John Sykes