

Julie Grieves

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 31 March 2011 14:11
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: EP/16/11

From: East Preston Parish Council
Sent: 31 March 2011 14:07
To: Anita Gardner
Subject: EP/16/11

Dear Anita,

Please could you accept the following as this council's objections to the above Application, as it is over 4000 characters so I cannot input it online. Let me know if you would like a more official version.

Thanks,

Simon Cross - Clerk to the Council

East Preston Parish Council
Council Cabin
Sea Road
EAST PRESTON
West Sussex
BN16 1LP

Tel: (01903) 770050

At its meeting held on Monday, 28th March 2011, the Planning Committee of this council agreed unanimously to comment on this Application as follows.

The Council has major concerns about this Application, and wishes to OBJECT on the following grounds:

1. The design of the building is inappropriate for its immediate surroundings and does not harmonise with the existing traditional buildings in this parade of shops and the residential accommodation above. Parade Mansions in East Preston's southern shopping area is located in an area of special sensitivity that deserves protection from unsympathetic development. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of the East Preston Village Design Statement (pages 8 and 15 refer).
2. The proposed development would result in material detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties by reason of overshadowing, loss of natural sunlight and its oppressive and overbearing impact. The proposal would thereby detract from the amenities and quiet enjoyment of these properties in conflict with Policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan.

3. The proposal to site the construction of this four storey building on the boundary to abut the single storey shop property, 119 Sea Road, together with the close proximity to the boundary (approximately 3m) and two storey dwelling at 121 Sea Road would be unneighbourly and would result in severe overlooking of the gardens of 121 Sea Road and Coastguard Cottages to the immediate south of the site. The cottages are identified as Buildings of Character and are recognised as contributing to the character and appearance of the area and deserve protection. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies GEN7 and GEN22 of the Local Plan.
4. The proposed design of the higher level windows facing south would not solve the problem of overlooking. The design of the amenity space at roof level would be insufficient to protect the privacy of residents and prevent overlooking of adjacent properties. The proposed development has an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers and therefore again conflicts with Policy GEN7 of the Local Plan.
5. The development involving the demolition of existing buildings would result in the loss of two viable commercial businesses, Arun Business Suppliers and Capital Steel Structures. No report has been submitted to demonstrate that retail and commercial use is no longer viable nor that reasonable attempts have been made to market the premises for retail purposes. There is a need to maintain the existing hierarchy of shopping facilities to protect the vitality and viability of this village shopping area. The proposal is in conflict with Policy DEV30 of the Local Plan which is to prevent the loss of local shops which are of community benefit.
6. The proposed contemporary design and materials would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the adjoining existing Parade Mansions buildings which would adversely affect the street scene, contrary to Policy GEN7 of the Local Plan and to the provisions of the East Preston Village Design Statement.
7. The development would conflict with the objectives of the Government's Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3). The proposal fails to meet the objective of positively improving the character and environmental quality of the area and does not have regard to neighbouring buildings and the wider locality. The development should respect local character and the local environment should not be compromised.
8. The proposal conflicts with Policy GEN12 where the parking standards prescribe that provision is required for 18 on-site parking spaces for this twelve unit development. The shortfall of 6 on-site parking spaces together with the demolition of 9 existing garages on the site would significantly add to the hazards of existing on-street parking and lead to further potential highway safety problems in this area. The committee also felt that special consideration should be given to potential access problems for emergency services vehicles.

For these reasons, this Parish Council would like the District Council to refuse Planning Permission for this Application.

