



# EAST PRESTON PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Peter Cleveland  
Planning Officer – Arun District Council  
Civic Centre  
Maltravers Road  
LITTLEHAMPTON  
BN17 5LF

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

Tel: 01903 770050  
E-mail: [epparishcouncil@btconnect.com](mailto:epparishcouncil@btconnect.com)  
Website: [eastpreston.arun.gov.uk](http://eastpreston.arun.gov.uk)

1<sup>st</sup> October 2012

Dear Mr Cleveland

Re: EP/40/12 – 115-117 Sea Road, East Preston

The Planning Committee of this council considered the two substitute plans submitted for this Application at its meeting on Monday, 24<sup>th</sup> September. The committee was disappointed that the substitute plans do not address any of the objections previously submitted, and therefore the committee agreed that it would continue to object to this Application on the grounds set out below.

Additionally, the committee agreed to suggest that a site visit is offered before the Application is considered by the Development Control Committee.

1. This council understands that new development in the District is necessary to encourage new businesses into the area to provide local employment and thus boost the local economy. However, this council cannot support new development at the cost of existing businesses and employment within East Preston, especially when no report appears to have 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. The development would result in the loss of two viable commercial businesses, Arun Business Suppliers and Capital Steel Structures and nine garages (not eight) that are used as storage by other local small businesses.
2. At a meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> May attended by Kieran Stigant and Nigel Lynn, Chief Executives respectively of West Sussex County Council and Arun District Council, Mr Stigant stated that a better way of boosting the local economy would be to enable every business already here to employ just one more person, rather than having to encourage new big businesses into the county.
3. 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). The fact that the existing 115-117 Sea Road are not in keeping must be no reason for the proposed design to be out of keeping too, and the National Planning Policy Framework allows Planning Authorities to refuse

Planning Permission to buildings considered to be poorly designed.

4. 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. Although not clearly shown on the plans, the roof terrace would also impact upon the enjoyment of neighbouring property owners with the additional concern of noise pollution. The proposal would thereby detract from the amenities and quiet enjoyment of these properties in conflict with Saved Policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan.
5. The proposal to site the construction of this three storey building on the boundary to abut the single storey shop property, 119 Sea Road, together with the immediate proximity to the boundary and two storey dwelling at 121 Sea Road would be un-neighbourly 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 Saved Policies GEN7 and GEN22 of the Local Plan. Furthermore, 121 Sea Road was not a back garden development.
6. The plans with regards to the windows in Flats 2 and 6 are confusing. On the Indicative 3D Visuals drawing, south-east facing windows are clearly shown, but the impact of these windows is not shown on the Window Orientation Detail. These windows will be able to see into a number of windows on the western and northern elevations of 121 Sea Road, and that property's front garden.
7. 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 former Policy DEV30 of the Local Plan which is to prevent the loss of local shops which are of community benefit.
8. 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 Saved Policy GEN7 of the Local Plan and to the provisions of the East Preston Village Design Statement.
9. The proposal fails to improve 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.
10. The proposal provides only nine parking spaces for a development totalling fifteen double bedrooms. Local on-street parking is at a premium, especially during the summer and at weekends. Reference is made to the nearby car-park, but that has already been used as a reason not to provide more on-site parking for the recently-completed Tamarisk Apartments development on the corner of Sea Road and Manor Road. The car-park does not have the capacity to handle overspill parking for another development.
11. This council is concerned also that pedestrian access to the building is through the undercroft with no pavement and no obvious demarcation between pedestrian walkway and vehicle access. Clearly two-way vehicular access/egress is only possible by the omission of a walkway or pavement - there are obvious safety implications here.
12. The committee also felt that special consideration should be given to potential access problems for emergency services vehicles.

13. Page 11 of the “planning, sustainability, design and access statement” in entitled Access Considerations and confirms that the “visibility splays are in compliance” and that the width of the vehicle access is “adequate for cars to pass in opposite directions.” However, although compliant, it would only take one van or lorry to be involved for the narrowness of the vehicle access to lead to instances where vehicles entering from Sea Road may need to reverse back out to let other vehicles out. The danger inherent in reversing out blind in this situation must not be underestimated – if reversing out, visibility splays by necessity will be forgotten about.

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

Simon Cross – Clerk to the Council