

**From:** Carolyn Pannell [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 November 2014 21:39  
**To:** Anita Gardner  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: EP/149/14/PL re submission of EP/100/12

Dear Mrs Gardner,  
In response to East Preston Parish Councils objection Letter reference QWQC420.

Their previous objection Letter reference OWQC315 dated 3rd June 2013.  
Stated:-

1. The site is **"probably" too small** to be developed upon.
2. The proposed development is **too high** and will not be attractive.

Both points were deemed as erroneous comments in the Inspectorates Appeal report dated 6th January 2014  
ref: APP/C3810/A/13/2205105. It states:-

Point 12 says:- **"I am satisfied there would be enough private garden space for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling"**

Point 7 says:- **"I note that the maximum roof height of the proposed dwelling would be the same as No. 37"**

East Preston Parish Council views and objections seem to be based as per their Action Plan dated 1st October 2012:-  
**"apply all available regulatory means"** (page 37 of East Preston Action Plan) to submit an objection.  
THUS USING SUCH WORDS SUCH AS "PROBABLY", "MAY" both words suggest **"implying but less than probable"**, in the Parish's objections!

In page 13 of the Action Plan the Parish committee already lists:-  
BIG ISSUE 2: DEVELOPMENT.

States **"There are too many new homes in East Preston, we don't want any more"**

Considers, 6d HOUSING Page 25

**"Housing, DEVELOPMENT, is a BIG ISSUE"**

**"WE need to focus on having the SMALLEST possible amount of building of new housing in the community where the current obligation is for 30 affordable STANDARD HOUSES...". "WE will be aiming to USE OUR Neighbourhood Plan to INFLUENCE the FUTURE development of housing in EAST PRESTON."**

**"The Parish should consider adopting a policy of *SUPPORTING* and *APPROVING* the reconstruction internally of *EXISTING LARGE HOUSES* to convert them into *FLATS*.**

East Preston Parish Council, therefore, cannot be deemed as unbiased when these are their above views.

So once again the Parish is using the following wording:-

**1."the proposed development *MAY BE* un-neighbourly to neighbouring properties in Orchard Road and Windlesham Gardens"**

I ask is this the Parish "**applying all available regulatory means**" making erroneous comments, NOT valid comments, using the words "may be"?

**2." property *MAY* looked cramped"**

I ask is this the Parish "**applying all available regulatory means**" making erroneous comments, NOT valid comments, using the word "may".?

Yet you will now be fully aware and have a copies of all the emails between myself and the Parish concerning the above application at the meeting held on Monday 27th October 2014 which has been recorded, although the Parish was unaware of this at the time due to incorrect email addresses used by other persons contacting them concerning this.

You will also now be aware that Mr Cross personally read out aloud at the meeting Point 12 of the Inspectorates Appeal which states **"I am satisfied there would be enough private garden space for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling"**

I repeatedly pointed out that Arun Council Planning had been consulted about plot size, surrounding available space and design. The distance between the new proposed dwelling and boundary to the rear backing onto Windlesham Gardens was well within planning regulations.

You can see from the copies of the emails addressed to Mr Cross you now have that I re-iterated the events of the meeting and pointed out that all previous issues had been addressed. These had been listed by a Windlesham Garden resident, Mr Laker, he had also stated that these had been addressed, although he still had a concern about the dwelling now moving closer to his boundary. I had stood up in response and pointed out that the distance to this boundary had been discussed with planning and was acceptable under building regulations. Told the committee to refer to my Architects submission. It states **Under policy D DM3 - external space standards. Which states minimum rear garden length is 10m and the design at its shortest point it is 11.79m. The Minimum rear garden is 85m squared and the design is 140m squared!** Confirming the Inspectorates findings.

In Scale it states **"Footprint of the proposed house is 80.2M squared and the proposed plot measures 310m squared"**

During the meeting the two male councillors discussed using GENE7 and then had decided they couldn't use it! All these points were emailed to Mr Cross, copies already provided to planning, and the meeting finished with Mr Cross saying they would go away to think about what their objections might be?!

In response to my email requesting information from Mr Cross, he responded by email on 28/10/14 with:-

You are correct, the Parish Council is a consultee; as I explained after the committee had voted on the application, the final decision is with Arun District Council as the Local Planning Authority.

Town and Parish Councils endeavour to make **valid** comments throughout the consultation process, and Arun District Council as Local Planning Authority will **only consider valid comments**. Equally we would not intentionally cause distress to residents.

As you will now have seen, I did not receive the emails from Colette Hanson, and Colette has apologised and explained. You are legally entitled to have filmed last night's meeting; I realise it is **too late** to tell you that now, but at least you now know for the future.

All of the above clearly shows that the new submitted Letter re the new design are **not valid** comments and the Parish is clearly aware of this and are using words such as, **MAY BE** and **MAY** as erroneous comments, knowing the sentences following these are not true. All the evidence presented before them before, during and after the meeting had proven these statements to be untrue and the committee can be heard to acknowledge these during the meeting. Or are they still just "**applying all available regulatory means**" in their objection?

Cllr Tester had declared a personal interest in application EP/149/14/PL, as a fellow resident of Orchard Road. Voted an Objection.

In observations of the Parish minutes:- paragraph 4 states The Clerk had circulated to Councillors before the meeting the reason the council had recommended refusal of previous planning application EP/100/12 and the Planning Inspectorate report on Appeal APP/C3810/A/13/2205105. So the committee was clearly fully informed before, during and after the meeting via my emails re-iterating this. Although the grounds to object stated by Mr Cross at the end of the meeting were different than listed in the minutes!

Therefore, their Letter submitted objecting against this planning application cannot be taken into consideration for all of the flawed reasons I have pointed out Their views **may be** biased and **may be** prejudice and **may be** trying to influence a false impression.

Yours sincerely,

CAROLYN PANNELL