# EAST PRESTON PARISH COUNCIL

Council Office
122 Sea Road
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 1NN

Tel: 01903 770050
E-mail: epparishcouncil@btconnect.com
Website: **eastpreston.arun.gov.uk**

Mrs Anita Gardner
Arun District Council
by email

25th February 2015

Dear Anita,

Re: Planning Application EP/2/15/RES

The Planning Committee of this council considered this Application at its meeting on Monday, 23rd February. The committee has little experience of considering Reserved Matters Applications but understood it could comment upon four aspects of the Application: appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The committee understands some of its comments may ultimately beyond the scope of what it can comment upon, and apologies up front for any such comments.

The committee wishes to object to the proposal on the following grounds:

**Layout:**

The committee continues to feel five houses is too many for this site, and four would be the correct number; provided the four properties remain within the footprint of four of the properties, freeing up additional amenity space;

Vehicular access itself is narrow, only just wide enough for two modern cars to pass; although access specifically is not a reserved matter, pragmatically layout does encompass access;

On-site parking is deemed insufficient for the potential number of vehicles these properties could generate; saved policy GEN12 of the Arun Local Plan 2003 suggests each of these properties should have one dedicated parking space each and one parking space each for visitors "in curtilage where possible". No visitor spaces are suggested at all by this proposal, thus forcing overspill parking into already-congested local streets with little room to take more parking. The West Sussex County Council parking calculator indicates eight parking spaces should be provided for the development; even reducing the proposal to 2No 2-bed units and 2No 3-bed units, the parking calculator says seven spaces should be provided. Paragraph 4.20 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan advises "98% of respondents [to an East Preston community-wide survey] agreed that new buildings should have adequate parking spaces within their plot to avoid an increase in on-road parking." This proposal is therefore in conflict with the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan

cont'd

Parking space P1, at the western end of the entrance, seems ill-positioned, complicating access from and especially in to the site; the committee is also concerned parking space P1 will compromise access for emergency vehicles; paragraph 13.3.28 of the emerging Arun Local Plan states, "well designed parking provision should be an integral part of the layout."

The visibility splay from the site in to Sea Road is inadequate and possibly sub-standard; the Applicant for previous Application EP/83/12 was West Sussex County Council, and in the report for Planning Inspectorate Appeal APP/C3810/A/13/2199149, the inspector refers twice (in paras 8 and 9) to the appellant being the Highway Authority and therefore able to control certain matters around this concern. With reference to paragraph 8 of the appeal report, the council would agree there are times when "Sea Road is not busy", but there are also times when Sea Road is very busy, and this is ignored in the inspector's report. The council receives several reports each year of cars perceived to be speeding up and down Sea Road, and this is an area of the village the council is working with Sussex Police on. With reference to paragraph 9 of the appeal report, obviously, the new Applicant is not West Sussex County Council and so is not the Highway Authority, therefore the new Applicant does not have control "to build out the kerb line [...] through a Section 278 Agreement" or "parking restrictions within the southern visibility splay", parking restrictions it is likely the Parish Council would object to during any consultation. On-street parking in this part of the village is already at a premium. Pedestrian access to the site is poor, possibly unsafe, as there is no alternative but for pedestrians to access the site via the vehicular access; although the planning inspector's report concludes in paragraph 10 "the proposal would not result in a danger to highway users", nowhere earlier in his report does he address the issue of pedestrians accessing the site safely along the sole combined vehicular and pedestrian access; although he does mention it in paragraph 15. Saved policy GEN7 of the Arun Local Plan 2003 says, "Planning permission will only be granted for schemes [...] allows for the safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles, giving priority to pedestrians" – this council therefore feels this proposed access still conflicts with this saved policy.

**Scale:**

The committee feels the proposal conflicts with Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan 2011 – 2031 as it does not "make the best possible use of the available land [...] in terms of scale".

The above comments on number of houses and on-site parking apply here too. Additionally, all five proposed gardens are shorter than the minimum depth of 10m quoted in Policy D DM3 of the emerging Arun Local Plan;

The proposed gardens for properties D2 and D4 are both smaller than the minimum garden area as quoted in Policy D DM3 of the emerging Arun Local Plan; the planning inspector stated in his report, "I see no reason to doubt that adequate private gardens could be provided at the reserved matters stage." This council contends adequate private gardens have not be proposed at the reserved matters stage, taking the Local Plan external space standards into consideration.

The committee preferred the height of D1 in the previous Application for this site, EP/83/12, as it provided a nice step-down from the adjacent listed building Baytree Cottage, before property D2 went up again in height. In Application EP/83/12, both D1 and D2 appear to be lower than Baytree Cottage, whereas the current Application has both being the same height as Baytree Cottage. The planning inspector stated in

cont'd

paragraph 21 of his report, "I also agree with the Council that the form and proportions of the two frontage houses should be kept to the indicative design in order to harmonise with the street scene and preserve the setting of the adjacent listed Baytree Cottage".

**Landscaping:**

The committee agreed it had no objections to the proposed landscaping for the site.

**Appearance:**

The committee commends the developer and the architects for the proposed choice of materials and the cottagey style of the proposed properties.

For the above reasons, this committee asks Arun District Council not to approve the Reserved Matters proposed in this Application.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Simon Cross – **Clerk to the Council**