



# EAST PRESTON PARISH COUNCIL

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

Tel: 01903 770050

<http://eastpreston.arun.gov.uk>

Email: [epparishcouncil@btconnect.com](mailto:epparishcouncil@btconnect.com)

## **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES:** of the Committee Meeting held on Monday, 25<sup>th</sup> June 2018 at East Preston Infant School, Lashmar Road, East Preston at 18:00hrs

**MEMBERS** Councillors E Linton, G Mathias (Chairman), D Moore and S Wilkinson

**PRESENT:**

**ALSO:** Clerk to the Council, Simon Cross

Mrs S Vos, East Preston & Kingston Preservation Society

**ABSENT:** Councillors C Bowman and S Toney

---

The meeting scheduled for 11<sup>th</sup> June had not taken place as the committee would not have been quorate. For two of the Applications to be considered at that meeting, responses had needed to be submitted to Arun District Council by 21<sup>st</sup> June, i.e. before this meeting. The Clerk had asked all committee members for their comments upon those two Planning Applications and then referred these to the Chairman of the Committee, Cllr Mathias. The committee had agreed not to object to those two Planning Applications, EP/61/18/HH 41 Roundstone Crescent and EP/65/18/HH 14 Tamarisk Way.

The meeting opened at 18:02.

### **428/18 APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies and a reason for absence were accepted from Cllrs Toney (on council business at Angmering School) and Bowman (unavailable).

### **429/18 PERSONAL AND/OR PREJUDICIAL/PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No interests were declared.

### **430/18 PUBLIC SESSION**

No members of the public were present.

### **431/18 ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL (ADC) PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The committee considered the following Planning Applications:

#### **Observations by 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018**

**None**

#### **Observations by 5<sup>th</sup> July 2018**

**EP/70/18/HH** Erection of 1.82m brick wall to replace existing hedge along norther boundary, with vehicular and pedestrian access points  
Preston House, Seafield Road, East Preston, BN16 1NA

Mrs Vos advised the East Preston & Kingston Preservation Society would be objecting to this Application as the removal of the existing hedge was contrary to the detail of the Area of Special Character into which Seafield Road fell.

No other public representations had been received.

The committee AGREED unanimously to object to this Planning Application for the same reasons as the Preservation Society.

Observations by 12<sup>th</sup> July 2018

**EP/83/18/HH** Replacement side extension  
61 Roundstone Crescent, East Preston, BN16 1DQ

Mrs Vos stated the Preservation Society would be objecting to this Application as the style of the proposed roof was basically bad design, unnecessarily large for the proposed extension. The Society had no objections to the concept of a side extension to the property.

No other public representations had been received.

The committee AGREED unanimously to object on the same grounds as the Preservation Society.

**432/18 WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (WSCC) PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

There were no West Sussex County Council Planning Applications to be considered.

**433/18 LICENSING APPLICATIONS**

There were no licensing applications to consider.

**434/18 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2018**

The committee AGREED the Minutes could be signed as a true record of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> May. This action was duly completed by the Chairman.

**435/18 MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Minute 360/18 – Correspondence** – the Clerk confirmed Cllrs Mathias and Toney had met with the Preservation Society's reps Mr Sawers and Mrs Vos on 31<sup>st</sup> May to write a submission to the Arun Planning Peer Review. Their output was submitted on 1<sup>st</sup> June and can be found at Appendix A below.

**Minute 360/18 – Correspondence** – the Clerk reported Cllr Mathias had agreed to go to the briefing about Arun Local Plan – Non-Strategic Sites Development Plan Document on 15<sup>th</sup> June but on 14<sup>th</sup> June they had reviewed this decision and agreed it was not essential for East Preston Parish Council to be represented at that meeting after all. The council has already expressed its willingness to revisit the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan should the village be required to take more housing although there is no housing figure in the Neighbourhood Plan and no obvious sites for more housing.

**436/18 RECENT DECISIONS**

\* denotes Application against which the council raised objections

**EP/40/18/T** Removal of two lower branches...  
Walnut Tree Cottage, Preston Hall, The Street, East Preston

- EP/7/18/PL \*** Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2 no. dwellings...  
Land rear of Beechlands Cottages, Beechlands Close, East Preston  
Approved subject to Conditions (Development Control Committee)
- EP/51/18/HH** Single storey rear extension  
34 Roundstone Crescent, East Preston  
Approved subject to Conditions (Delegated)
- EP/52/18/PL \*** Demolition of existing dwelling & the erection of 7No. residential dwellings...  
Scorton, 9 Lime Tree Close, East Preston  
Refused (Delegated)

The reasons given for the refusal of this Planning Application were:

“The proposed development by virtue of its bulk, height, siting, garden size, site coverage, length and proximity to the boundaries and amount and position of car parking, would represent an overdevelopment of the site which would appear unduly cramped and out of character and detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The development would therefore be contrary to policies GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan, Policies 1 and 4 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

“The submitted information does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the position of the dwellings on the site frontage would not adversely affect the setting of the listed building Wisteria Cottage, opposite, in The Street The proposal would therefore be damaging to the setting of the listed building in conflict with policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.”

There was general concern this Application had been turned down as, although the council had raised objections to it, this had been a well-presented Application considerably better than some other alternatives for the site.

#### 437/18 COMPLIANCE MATTERS

- ENF/72/18** Alleged breach of condition  
**ENF/75/18** Alleged unauthorised work to property  
Tudor Lodge, 125a Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1NX

On hold pending the outcome of Planning Applications EP/24/18/DOC (Approved) and EP/30/18/DOC

- ENF/96/18** Alleged unauthorised building works  
66 Vermont Drive, East Preston

Case closed. Update received from the Planning Compliance Officer on 15<sup>th</sup> June:

“Following further discussions & negotiations with the owner of the property, I can now confirm that the velux style windows are to provide light via tunnels to the ground floor and, are therefore deemed permitted development with clear glazing. Planning consent will no longer be required for these windows.

“The owner also proposes to change the proposed cladding & porch, in that, they will omit the cladding & instead use white render to match the existing materials and, reduce the height of the porch so that the eaves meet the height of the existing roof. Again, this would be deemed permitted development not requiring the submission of a planning application. It is the intention of the owner to submit a certificate of lawfulness for proposed works in this regard.”

- ENF/110/18** Alleged unauthorised non compliance with approved plans  
3 The Street, East Preston, BN16 1JJ

- ENF/117/18** Alleged unauthorised breach of condition 3 discharged under EP/24/18/DOC  
Tudor Lodge, 125A Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1NX
- Case closed - Planning Application EP/69/18/DOC (Approved)
- ENF/119/18** Alleged unauthorised non compliance with approved plans  
9 Nursery Close, East Preston, BN16 1QD
- ENF/153/18** Alleged unauthorised breach of condition  
131a Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1PD
- On hold pending a revised Planning Application to make this property legally residential
- ENF/167/18** Alleged unauthorised building works  
29 Orchard Road, East Preston, BN16 1RB
- tbc** tbc (alleged building too close to Sea Road on the western elevation)  
Tudor Lodge, 125A Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1NX
- ENF/227/18** Alleged unauthorised out-building  
14 Sea Lane, East Preston, BN16 1NG

**438/18** **PLANNING INSPECTORATE APPEALS**

None

**439/18** **EAST PRESTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (EPNP)**

Nothing to report.

**440/18** **AREAS OF SPECIAL CHARACTER**

Nothing to report.

**441/18** **CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

**442/18** **NEW MATTERS FOR THE NEXT MEETING (9<sup>TH</sup> JULY)**

Nothing was raised.

*The Meeting closed at 18:40.*

Chairman: *Cllr G Mathias* Date: **9<sup>th</sup> July 2018**

Hello Steve,

Please find below some comments from East Preston Parish Council for the Peer Review's consideration. The comments are the result of a meeting between members of the Parish Council's Planning & Licensing Committee and the East Preston & Kingston Preservation Society, with which the council works closely. Parish councillors are not professionals and maybe do not understand plans as easily as Planning Officers and these comments will hopefully be seen as ways in which that gap in understanding could be bridged.

If you would like any clarification of any of the points, just get in touch and I will try and help.

The comments are not in any particular order or priority.

Thanks,

Simon

\* \* \* \* \*

Although we appreciate /DOC and /NMA and other such applications still appear in the weekly list, it would be useful if these could be emailed out in the same way as applications on which we are statutory consultees. Something in the email header could presumably differentiate those for which we are statutory consultee and those for which we are not. We have a process here by which I forward all Planning Application emails to my council's committee members and it would be useful if that could happen on all applications.

Part of Arun's own guidance says plans should include measurements to the boundary of a property but such measurements do not always appear on plans which have been validated and therefore made available to us. Similarly we would like to see plans include a measurement to other significant buildings affected by the proposal.

We would like to see all Applications show a streetscene giving a fair representation of the properties either side.

Plans using phrases such as "left elevation" and "right elevation" are not as helpful as those clearly indicating "north elevation" or such like.

This may already be the case, we do not know – is the Planning Officer who is given an Application to work on always different to any Planning Officer who has given pre-application advice. We believe they should be to prevent any conflicts of interest.

When decisions are made it sometimes feels as if the Planning Officers are finding ways to get around the Neighbourhood Plan rather than enforcing it. There certainly seems to be inconsistencies in the way in which the Neighbourhood Plan is used against Planning Application. Words within the Neighbourhood Plan, for example "harmonising" and "surrounding" are sometimes given rather loose interpretations such as properties some distance away on a private estate being used as reason to permit something out-of-character within another street on the same private estate. Another example would be where a property with a front dormer 60m from the Application site was used as justification for allowing a front dormer.

Sometimes it is difficult to see where the "no such thing as precedence" in Planning legislation holds true.

There was a feeling of general inconsistency across officer reports.

We feel ADC could be stronger in resisting changes to one of a string of matching properties which then puts that string out of kilter. The same applies to proposals for any half of a pair of semi-detached properties.

Concern about how the proximity of a Listed Building is built into (or not) the short description on an Application. This year we have seen two Applications submitted in a road which contains a Listed Building at one end of it. The Application further away included Listed Building in its short description; the building directly opposite the entrance to the Listed Building made no reference to the Listed Building. We contacted the Senior Planning Officer who said, "I understand the point your making. However, the applications go to officers with the description put on at registration stage. With hindsight for consistency sake both descriptions should have flagged up that they may have an impact on the setting of a LB. However, I can confirm that whilst not explicitly stating it under its description [nnn] has had regard to the setting of the Listed Building and has been taken into account when formulating the officer report." Despite that assurance, the property further away from the Listed Building has a written comment from the Conservation Officer whilst the property closer to the Listed Building has nothing visible from the Conservation Officer. We find it difficult to believe the Conservation Officer would not have commented on the proposal directly opposite the Listed Building, especially when the Parish Council and the Preservation Society both did, and yet she did comment on the proposal further away, an application to which nobody objected. If the Conservation Officer was consulted, this supports the earlier comment about inconsistency in officer reports; if the Conservation Officer was not consulted purely because the applicant did not mention Listed Building in the short description, that is something very wrong.

Across the District there seems to be concern about the standard of responses received from West Sussex County Council Highways to Planning Applications. We have asked our District Councillor before if the Development Control Committee will tackle this, especially after we have been to DCC meetings at which District Councillors have all said they do not believe Highways can say there is not going to be a problem at such and such a location when we all know there will be, and yet DCC does not seem to want to tackle this.

We have been concerned in the past where DCC members have said they personally like a particular style of property which is not-in-keeping with the locality for which it is proposed and/or the vernacular of the area. Personal preference should not enter into it.

Lack of right to reply for objectors at DCC. We understand there has to be a limit to right to reply, but currently at a DCC meeting, objectors speak first, supporters often a professional agent or developer, can respond and trash objectors' comments and the objectors have no opportunity to set the record straight. That doesn't seem very fair.

An email is sent weekly to District Councillors advising them of Planning Compliance cases opened and closed in the previous week. I have asked for my council to be included in the distribution list of this email, which I appreciate not all councils will be interested in, but have been told it is confidential and therefore not available to other councils. This smacks of a lack of trust. We are able to respect confidentiality when provided confidential information. Why should other councils be any less trustworthy than District Councillors or officers?

Could consideration be given to wider publication of yellow notices, especially for proposals in, for example, cul-de-sacs or roads through which people would not necessarily pass as a matter of course. A property in this village has recently been given Planning Permission to extend upwards and work has started. Residents of two other roads back on to the proposal site but did not know about the Planning Application because the yellow notice was only placed by the property which is in the hammerhead of a cul-de-sac with no passing vehicular traffic and not much more in the way of foot traffic. Whilst we do not doubt the yellow notice was appropriately located for the front of the property, properties backing on to the site could have benefitted from one or two other notices being put up. To be fair, usually residents backing on do find out in time but in this instance they did not and that has led to a lot of bad feeling.

Finally, there is a feeling ADC could do more to work with town and parish councils to in supporting objections and/or translating a town or parish council's objections into a something stronger, policy-based, after all Planning Officers are the experts.

Simon Cross - **Clerk to the Council**