

[REDACTED]

Please upload the below to the above application: an Objection from Felpham Parish Council.

Thank you



[REDACTED]

Dear Maria

Felpham Parish Council discussed the above application at our Planning Committee last evening (14th July) following the deferment of this application at the Arun Development Control Committee meeting of June 26th. As Chair of the Planning Committee of Felpham Parish Council I have been asked to write to you to reaffirm the position of Felpham Parish Council with regards to this application noting that the applicant wishes to have this item addressed at the Development Control Committee on July 29th.

As you may remember Felpham Parish Council had objected to this application with regards to the lack of provision of on site car parking and therefore the addition of vehicles from the residential element of this development to local road side parking. Thus ADC had failed to apply its own policy. As you are aware Arun District Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document clearly states under 2.12 that *"Parking provision should be sufficient to accommodate demand whilst exploiting the potential for sustainable travel, minimizing adverse effects on road safety and avoiding increased on-street parking demand."*

The applicant endeavoured to show via a Lambeth survey that there was sufficient on street parking to allow this development to go ahead with no on site provision for parking. This survey is, in our opinion, fundamentally flawed and has many errors within it. Some of these are as follows, which gives a flavour of the inaccuracy of the document, and I am sure given further scrutiny would elicit further inaccuracies.

1) Felpham Way was called Felpham Road (which is actually by St. Marys Church) and nearly a mile away from the application site;

2) 50 of the spaces detailed in the survey were in Summerley Lane, Firs Avenue, Felpham Gardens, Wick Lane and Clovelly Avenue yet it was claimed that these were within 200m of the development site (as stated by the applicant in their statement to the Development Control Committee dated 23rd June 2020), when most are patently not;

3) The Survey actually called Summerley Lane as Firs Avenue (thus there were two of them!). Firs Avenue is on the north side of Felpham Way whilst Summerley Lane is on the south side;

4) By their own measurements the 30 spaces detailed as being in Felpham Way would be a minimum of 180m in length. These could not be located going west (due to the Petrol station entrance and exit, a pedestrian crossing and a roundabout). They could neither go on the south side (as double yellow lines). So where could they go? On the north side going east there are at least 8 drop kerbs which have to be kept clear. Thus the 180 metres would have to be "stretched" significantly longer (possibly up to Wick Lane - itself a notoriously difficult junction to get out of) and therefore again not within 200m of the development.

The survey can only be construed as poor, inaccurate, misleading and done in haste and without checking. So many errors and inaccuracies does, again in our opinion, make the survey compromised and of not sufficient accuracy or professionalism to offer sufficient mitigation for it to be used instead of the application of the Arun District Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document.

I notice that in the email exchange between yourself and the applicant no effort has been made by the applicant to address the inaccuracies that we have highlighted apart for an apology in using Felpham Road instead of Felpham way. Even this does not acknowledge that there is a Felpham road and it is over a mile away from the development site.

I hope that this clearly lays down the position of Felpham Parish Council.

Yours sincerely

Glen Hewlett CEng MA BEng FIMechE
Chair Planning Committee
Felpham Parish Council