





From: Stephen milliner [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2018 21:17
To: Juan Baeza
Cc: Karl Roberts; Neil Crowther; Planning; Cllr. Terence Chapman; Cllr. Richard Bower
Subject: Re: 60 Vermont Drive - Application EP/132/18/DOC

Dear Mr Baeza

I made a small typo in my previous Email (amended now and highlighted in yellow) but I am sure you would have picked this up anyway.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Milliner

From: Stephen milliner [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 October 2018 16:49
To: Juan Baeza
Cc: Karl Roberts; Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk; planning@arun.gov.uk; Cllr. Terence Chapman; Cllr. Richard Bower
Subject: Re: 60 Vermont Drive - Application EP/132/18/DOC

Dear Mr Baeza

I see that you are now the case officer on the application.

I made two representations on the discharge of conditions (one for EP/131/18/DOC and one for EP/132/18/DOC).

Mr Crowther tells me that you have been provided with my two representations but I have informed Mr Crowther that only one has been uploaded to the planning portal. The below representation is still not on the planning portal so could the planning department please upload this soonest.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Milliner

From: Stephen milliner [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 September 2018 14:46
To: Anita Gardner
Cc: Karl Roberts; Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk; planning@arun.gov.uk; Cllr. Terence Chapman; Cllr. Richard Bower
Subject: 60 Vermont Drive - Application EP/132/18/DOC

Dear Mrs Gardner

I see that an application has been made to discharge Condition 10 of EP/69/17/L and you have been allocated as the case officer.

I have reviewed this application and may I make the following observations to assist you in your considerations.

The information submitted by Inspired Design shows little and certainly I would not deem the application adequate/ of sufficient **detail** to discharge the condition. The Council have asked for the **detail** but the drawing submitted shows very little.

As you know one of the major concerns of objectors to EP/69/17/L was the impact of delivery lorries/visitors and operatives as well as their parking (during the works including parking for delivery of materials).

The Vermont Drive cul-de-sac is extremely narrow and will not allow two cars to pass let alone a delivery vehicle (or other vehicle) park in the close for offloading of materials. Such a process would unreasonably hinder other residents from use of the road and also make access unsafe. I do hope the Council properly consider this application and see that under no circumstances is any parking allowed in Vermont Drive (the cul-de-sac element) for either operative vehicles, delivery vehicles or for machinery. May I also ask that in considering matters you see that any delivery vehicles/visitors should park on site or if you feel this is unreasonable that they park away from the Vermont Drive cul-de-sac and the intersection with the main Vermont Drive road so that the sight lines of people are not hindered and their safety is maintained. Ideally my preference is to see no off site parking anywhere. The drawing hardly shows anything and certainly does not demonstrate sufficient on site parking for deliveries, operatives or visitors.

With the proposal for the the skip to be parked at the front of the host dwelling I fail to see how deliveries can be offloaded at the site without obstructing visitors or free movement of trades people/operatives (they wont be able to park at site as their route will be blocked). It will hinder parking. You can see that the applicants agent has put little thought in to the application to discharge the planning condition and there is no written text on how parking will be achieved and how or what vehicle types /size/numbers will be at the site during the works at any one time.

The drawing shows a hoarding line but it does not specifically state the hoarding line will be entirely on the property of 60 Vermont Drive or how such hoarding is supported. Clearly bracing from the host dwelling or anywhere on the carriageway will prevent vehicles from entering the site and I am sure the owners of 62 Vermont Drive will not wish any hoarding supports (either above or below ground) to be on their land.

The hoarding line does not show the detail of the hoarding (treatment or height or materials etc).

The parking provisions do not show the detail of parking and how such parking will not prevent dirt and mud from being deposited on Vermont Drive (a private road mainly occupied by elderly people). I would have thought it essential that the hard surfaces for parking be constructed in the first instance (or sacrificial hard surfaces) to prevent this occurring and so vehicles can properly park on the site.

It has already been established that the host dwelling eaves height does not permit your average trade persons vehicle to pass at the pinch point of the new carriageway and the eaves so where will these trade persons vehicles park? They will not be able to reach the proposed parking without hitting the host dwelling or smashing in to the hoarding and trespassing on the land of 62 Vermont Drive.

Legally the host dwelling can remain occupied/habitable during the development works/ construction of the new dwelling. There should therefore remain parking spaces for the host dwelling equal to that which exists prior to the approval of application EP/69/17/L. The parking spaces for operatives, deliveries, machinery and visitors should be in addition to the current parking provisions. It appears from the drawing that the applicant has wrongly extinguished the existing two parking provisions for the host dwelling (demolition of the garage and provision of a skip at the front of the premises).

Senior officers at the Council have given me assurances that the planning department will consider the discharge of conditions carefully/properly and I do hope this occurs. Can I please ask the Council see that the amenity and safety of residents in Vermont Drive is not compromised and disturbance is minimised. This is a legal obligation as set out in Planning Condition 10 and the applicant should not be favoured.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Milliner
2 South View
East Preston
BN16 1PX