

Pre-Submission Plan Schedule of GENERAL PUBLIC Comments Received

17th April to 29th May (Anonymised. Full details held by East Preston Parish Council)

REF	Page or Policy ref	Representation	Observation & Recommendation
001		<p>Are people voting for good planning, or for moving what they do not want away from their own nice estates.</p> <p>2.3 As a minor point. Willowhayne Estate was not developed until well after the land was bought in 1930 and very far from completed after the War.</p> <p>Plan B A minor point. The green access strip from Station Rd into Langmeads has not existed for many years. It is part of the new development there north of the churchyard.</p> <p>4.1, 4.3 As a poll the results are naturally contradictory in one respect. Apart from a very few virgin sites, any rebuilding by developers, rather than individual house owners, is bound to mean many more houses and flats on that same area. Can we ban developers from speculating in this way? 30 units will be built, and then more houses will be required, in the usual way.</p> <p>Policy 1 Planning applications include housing density. A general idea of the existing housing density in various areas should be indicated on the Plan.</p> <p>4.10 Almost impossible. One for one development can retain the present village character. Developers four or more in place of one will do the very opposite.</p> <p>4.13 This 'soft landscape' will often be next to nothing, as is happening. Only the use of Building Lines for various roads, behind which buildings must be constructed, will ensure anything. And then much of the area may be car park unless parking at rear of houses is required.</p> <p>4.14 Two storey houses. A term that is a can of worms. Developers have</p>	<p>Wording amended.</p> <p>Note inserted under Plan B to this effect.</p> <p>A number of phrases have been reworded to clarify.</p>

	<p>often, in the past, built houses with false mansards. Calling a three storey building two storey. A block of flats in Worthing Road [west] is even worse. It pretends to be two storey, but has another half storey of brickwork above the first floor windows to the raised eaves level. And then dormers in the roof.</p> <p>The scale and design of many dormers can be ruinous of all 'character'.</p> <p>4.17 If present planning proposals cover most of the 30 units required, then any such 'small dwellings' must assume building will continue after that batch is complete - or before.</p> <p>4.18 4.24 This relates to existing buildings more than those to be built. The car is destroying front gardens, verges, and garden walls.</p> <p>Areas Why not simplify and call them Policy [1 to 4] Areas. It is confusing otherwise.</p> <p>4.30 Essential. The walls etc protected needs to include brick. A length of flint wall cannot be left standing out at the road frontage, with neighbouring properties open.</p> <p>4.31 The character of a village depends much more on how the main streets into and through it are laid out with buildings and spaces, than what is done in a secluded estate.</p> <p>The old roads of the village should not be used for building more flats. Blocks and groups of flats should be well away from the street scene, in suitable parts of existing estates.</p> <p>To allow building flats next to existing flats, means each new block becomes an excuse for another. Ribbon development along all the main roads with a few remnants of 'heritage'.</p> <p>4.32 Much of this area has quite modest housing density, by recent standards [or lack of them]. The car has ruined Roundstone Drive.</p> <p>4.38 The football ground is a part of Lashmar recreation ground, as provided before WW2. Leased.</p> <p>4.49 Access to the beach for the disabled. Good. As long as the road is not widened and improved for car access, to a dead end.</p> <p>4.51 Shops are being lost to other uses.</p> <p>4.57 More needs to be known about future use of the Youth Club. Its loss will be short-sighted folly.</p> <p>5.7 Heritage Assets. Why on earth is the Old School not included on one of</p>	<p>Cross-referenced colours on Proposals Map and Policy numbers</p> <p>A number of phrases have been reworded to clarify</p> <p>It is already on Arun's Local List for East Preston: nos. 35 and 35b</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the Lists. It merits inclusion far more than some of the buildings suggested.</p> <p>The Maps have heavy red lines about the parish boundary. This obscures any coloured line that would indicate the policy for Station Road etc.</p>	
002		<p>I did have a comment on areas that should be protected and don't remember seeing the cricket pitch as one of them?</p>	<p>Clerk responded directing respondent the cricket field is covered by bulletpoint iv of Policy 7 on pages 27/28</p>
003		<p>In response to the neighbourhood plan I think it would be a really good idea to put double yellow lines down much of station road, both sides of the train station crossing.</p> <p>A lot of people park down this road to avoid paying for parking at the station car park (as there cars are only there Monday to Friday during work hours) and it's making the road very dangerous to all road users, and causing traffic delays.</p> <p>Ever since the Churchfields development has been finished and the development where the texaco garage used to be more and more residents and parking there cars in the road causing traffic chaos. 5 years ago this never happened, and I see more units of housing are going to be built down station road which is only going to compound the problem, as it seems that all more housing plans never truly allow enough space for cars.</p> <p>As a resident of the Churchfields development I can also say due to the cars that now park down station road getting in and out of the development is now positively dangerous and it won't be long before there's a serious car/cycle accident! This will be the same problem for the new developments down station road I'm quite sure.</p> <p>If double yellow lines were put down the road both sides, the majority of these cars would then park in the car park and it would make the road a lot safer for cyclist and motorists and make the traffic flow a lot easier.</p> <p>I would appreciate your thoughts and opinions on this matter.</p>	<p>Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.</p>

004	<p>I would like to thank you for the "East Preston Neighbourhood Plan".</p> <p>I wish to suggest that something should be done about people parking on corners or very near them in Lavinia Way, both private and trade vehicles, which really do cause "an accident waiting to happen". Frequently it is impossible to tell whether there is something coming in the opposite direction when trying to pass. There are lay-bys which could be used but not so convenient always. Maybe a letter to all households might do the trick with the threat of yellow lines if it does not work. In any case I am sure it is illegal to park in dangerous positions.</p>	<p>Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.</p>
005	<p>Most of my concerns about the EPNP are about protecting green spaces and enhancing these, and also built-up areas, in as natural a way as possible. I will comment on this after mentioning two other matters.</p> <p>Provision of 30 new houses is mentioned on pages 15, 19 and 27, mercifully on previously used land. Even this concession will not alleviate the extra traffic and pressure on resources on an already strained infrastructure. I know of nobody in the village who wants a single extra dwelling, and I oppose this proposal.</p> <p>Mention is made in 5.20 on page 36 of the well-known problems at the Roundstone level crossing. Whilst it is not going to be a quick solution, I would like to see reference in EPNP to a desire in the future to have a road bridge built over the railway at this point. The measures mentioned in the plan will achieve very little.</p> <p>On the major subject of green spaces and making East Preston as naturally attractive as possible, there is a serious omission from the Plan. I work in various capacities for local and national conservation organisations, and have advised on many such proposals. Before they reach me they all have this serious omission, which is that the term 'green' is not defined. This is not a trivial point, as the word 'green' means different things in different contexts. Many ill-informed attempts at beautifying villages elsewhere have been disastrous, especially in terms of making them less attractive to wildlife and a source of various nuisances in the future. The planting of horticultural plants, especially bulbs like daffodils and shrubs like rhododendrons, in green spaces, for example, has created uncontrollably invasive nuisance. Such ill-advised activities may also be unlawful under the Wildlife and Countryside Act. All plants other than native British species that are indigenous to Sussex are potentially damaging to our local environment and its wild food chains.</p>	

	<p>I strongly recommend, therefore, that 'green' be defined in the way it is used by conservation organisations, namely to mean 'planted and populated by native local species of plants, animals and other living things'. If residents can similarly be encouraged to plant more of them in their gardens, then so much the better. The bulk of a natural habitat will be plants, and if we are to generate biodiversity these need to be adapted to local soil and weather conditions if they are to thrive. This has the added advantage in locally managed areas of lower maintenance and replacement costs; lower levels of disease, invasion and unchecked growth of pest populations; better habitat for a wider range of species in terms of food sources and nesting places; and no need for chemical or other unnatural controls. Without this definition of 'green', given the levels of ecological ignorance in the general population, and in planners in particular, we could have more and more tragedies like the Japanese Knotweed plague, and like the rabbit, fox and cane toad plagues in Australia.</p> <p>Section 3.1 on page 19 refers to sensitivity to 'the natural environment', but this is not expanded upon in any bullet point, nor defined. After all, Japanese Knotweed is 'natural', but it is not native. Section 3.3b on page 19 refers to protection of open spaces, but there is no mention of controlling what is planted in them. The excellent provision in 3.3d on page 20 would gradually be compromised if East Preston does not have a 'native species only' policy, as pests thriving elsewhere on non-native habitat will eventually invade the allotments.</p> <p>The reference in 4.7i to landscaping should, by the same token, refer to the use of native species for this landscaping, not horticultural and other alien species and varieties. In 4.24 on page 24 it is worth pointing out that verges of native species are easy to maintain and give the added benefit of being full of attractive flowers and butterflies. Non-native verges and other such areas get out of control easily and end up being manicured to the point of being sterile, colourless and soulless. Section 4.41 on page 29 refers to having 'natural habitats wherever possible', but this can only happen if the definition of 'green' that I have suggested is adopted, and if the planners and implementers are suitably informed as to what is natural in Sussex, and therefore native, and what is not. The same applies to Proposal 5 on page 38, 5.28 and 5.29, which will only be a sustainable and low maintenance proposal if 'green' means 'native species only'.</p> <p>Broadly commendable as the Pre-Submission Plan is, I urge planners and implementers to seek advice from the recognised national and local conservation organisations in support of a plan enshrining 'green' to mean 'native species</p>	<p>Details of species are not really for the NP in such a suburban area, but have put in a comment on native species planting in Policy 6, for Langmeads Field</p>
--	--	--

		only'. This will make a significant contribution to the catastrophic decline in native wildlife in Sussex during the last 50 years, as well as make East Preston a more genuinely green village. I live locally and would be pleased to meet with interested parties to expand on the points I have raised. You already have literature of mine prepared for other villages where the residents were interested in making them more wildlife friendly ('Towards a Village Wildlife Management Policy' and 'Towards Village Wildlife Conservation'), and I would be only too pleased to supply copies to interested parties. I commend these policies to East Preston, to be included in the EPNP.	
006	Policy 11	Simon – A very thorough document. I only have one comment – page 30, policy 11 re shops etc. We have an over abundance of eateries! Can't these be curbed somewhat?	Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.
007		Dear Simon Cross (clerk to the council) I have recently read through the documents pertaining to the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and I found it most stimulating in its content. I was quite surprised how easily it read, and would like to congratulate all those contributing to the contents. It is quite obvious a tremendous amount of research has been necessary, and I admire the dedication of those partaking, lead by our Chairman Councillor Joop Duijf. It has always been a concern that the future plans could erode our "gaps" and open spaces which in my opinion must be rejected with vigour.	No action required
008 – 12/05 /14		We spoke with Peter? At the session and mentioned that we feel it would be helpful to all the people using the road ie residents, emergency service, refuse collectors, community bus etc that if the road was a <u>one way</u> road in Cotswold Way and Lashmar Road that it would be a good move forward. Also the green opposite our house could be made into a parking space (like the one along the road). Parking in the road, it is an unwritten rule that people park on the left of the road, however, if visitors etc don't know they park on the right there could be a problem.	Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.

009		<p>Dear Mr Cross, I am puzzled by the paradox in the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan created by paragraphs 4.35 and 5.24. Paragraph 5.24 states correctly that there is “congestion at the North shops” and “insufficient parking provisions on the Martletts site” Paragraph 4.35 states that planning permission has been granted for 5 units on The Martletts, Sea Road. That Martletts site could be used to ease the congestion at the North shops and ease the insufficient parking on the Martletts site. As it is now planned a further 5 units will add to the congestion and the inadequate parking instead of creating a car park. Does the planning dept. talk to the Highways dept? Is logic applied to planning permissions? Does anyone listen to us residents? Or is the council so money driven that it has to cash in on such an asset and ignore the residents well-being?</p>	<p>Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.</p>
010		<p>Dear Mr Cross, I have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and would like to comment on one item in particular. I refer you to points 4.22 and 4.23 on page 24. The state of The Parish Report of January 2014 states: “Tourism 3.38 The parish is mainly a residential area with few facilities for visitors to stay. <u>There are, however, an increasing number of properties available for holiday lets, continuing a historic pattern in the village,</u> where there are still some second homes not occupied throughout the year.” Such historic pattern needs to continue with the <i>furnished holiday lets</i> at the higher end of the market bringing family oriented clients to this beautiful part of the Sussex coast. I have experienced no nuisance, noise or behaviour and the need for extra security of these prestigious properties has led to a decrease in the incidents of vandalism in the area. Despite fears of the Angmering on Sea Estate Residents Association Ltd. There have been few, if any, parking problems despite the imposition of Parking Restrictions imposed in the absence of any West Sussex County Council Traffic Regulation Orders. According to the East Preston Festival magazine there are fourteen eating places in the village and these are mentioned on the web sites of the various holiday lets. The quick turn around at the end of a short let requires intense activity regarding the cleaning of the properties, the laundering of much bed linen, mirror repairs, window cleaning, gardening etc and a dedicated work force is required.</p>	<p>Wording on holiday lets redrafted to clarify (4.22)</p>

		<p>This and the variety of jobs created for local people can only improve the local economy. I therefore believe that these <i>furnished holiday lets</i> should retain their status quo in respect of planning requirements, they are not houses which encroach on neighbours and therefore do not pose a problem.</p>	
011		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 13, paras 2.11 and 2.12 The distinction between dwellings and households should be explained. Suggested text: A dwelling is a building that may be lived in by one or more people and used as a household. A dwelling may or may not be occupied. 2. There is an area immediately south of Angmering station that has mixed commercial uses. This is not shown on Plan B (page 17) or Proposal map 2 (page 41) 3. Page 22, para 4.6 the definition of the four character areas is poorly explained. (a) the proposals map should be given a page reference e.g. are shown on the proposals map (page 40) (b) It should be explained that the character areas are referred to in the plan by their associated policy number e.g. Character Area 1 = Policy 2 etc (c) In the key to the proposals map on page 40, each colour should be identified as Policy 2, Character Area 1 etc. 4. Page 28, Policy 7ii, South Walk. I understand that South Walk is on the greens ward to the south of Tamarisk Way. However this is not described in the text or the maps (except simply 7ii on the Proposals Map, page 41) 5. Page 34, Proposal 2viii. The Hollies address is given as Station Road, whereas on page 36, para 5.16 it is given as Worthing Road. After investigating I find that it in fact on Worthing Road, at the corner of Copse View. 6. Page 37, para 5.26. The paragraph ends with; "...establishing a coastal cycle route as outlined in para 5.18 above. Para 5.18 makes no reference to a cycle route. 7. Page 36, para 5.18 Access to Parish. No reference is made to access from the north across Angmering station level crossing and into Station Road. 8. <u>Editorial errors</u> Page 9. Third paragraph down Words that should be separated by spaces: "neighbourhoodsshould" and "ordersshould". <p>Compliments to the authors for the extensive work that they have put into</p>	<p>Definitions for each now included</p> <p>Map amended to include this area</p> <p>Notes a and b: the Character Area colours and numbers have been cross-referenced on the Proposal Map and in the text. Character Area number as well as Policy number put on Proposals Map Key</p> <p>Noted – added to description</p> <p>Correct road name inserted</p> <p>Correct para. number inserted</p> <p>Para 5.18 redrafted</p> <p>Noted and corrected</p>

		generating the Neighbourhood Plan.	
012		<p>Dear Simon,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>EP NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Public Consultation</u></p> <p>You invited comments. My immediate thoughts are that this is an excellent document which should command wide support. I recognise much of the old Parish Design Statement is carried forward into this document and applaud the consistency. Perhaps the Planning Authority will, at last, have to listen to the local views!</p> <p>I would want to particularly commend 4.20 [Parking Standards] for highlighting the problem but wonder whether 4.21 is too softly drafted such that it could be interpreted as one wished to support whatever provision a developer or planning applicant wanted. I suggest the Plan should be bold in stating what the majority of villagers want – no increase in on-street parking. To have any hope in achieving that aim, 4.21 should firmly state that all new or altered properties should have <u>two</u> off street parking spaces per dwelling, specified and shown on planning application drawings. While WSCC might override this desire we should still state the requirement.</p> <p>The major comments I offer for consideration are with respect to 5.20 [Rail Crossing]. Firstly I have no major objection to the proposed bridge but the requirement for a ramped bridge will result in a large unsightly dominating structure. The bridge is justified by the closure of Pagett's Crossing. That was suitable for foot crossing only and I suggest provision of a footbridge only would be more in keeping with the rural style of the village and that, as now, those on wheels (of whatever type) should await, like cars, the opening of the level crossing itself. One might then ask why not site the footbridge at Pagett's Crossing?</p> <p>Secondly with respect to 5.20 I think a major opportunity has been omitted from discussion. Currently I estimate the rail crossing is closed for approximately 18 to 20 minutes an hour. After detailed discussions and understanding of the railway signalling, the Parish Council is aware that there is no prospect of reducing this closed period¹. I think that this fact should be stated and that the Plan should</p>	<p>This policy has been worded as strongly as possible within the need to conform with adopted parking standards</p>

¹ When on the Parish Council I had discussions with Network Rail and have some personal knowledge of Railway Signalling, so would be happy to explain in detail should current Cllr's so require.

		<p>accept that the current closure time is consistent with the rural nature of the village which residents thus accept by choosing to live here. However the Plan should also acknowledge that Network Rail have long term plans to re-signal the West Coastway in order to reduce train headways. While this may be ten years ahead, the re-signalling project will enable the doubling of train frequencies. It does not take a genius to work out that this will double the time that the crossing is closed. Thus the crossing will be closed for more than 50% of the day. That, I suggest, will become unacceptable, particularly for those who work outside the village who, in peak times, will find the gates closed against them for 40 minutes in the hour. This is 'worst case' certainly, and will not happen overnight. However the Plan should highlight that the crossing problem is only going to get worse; probably much worse within the decade.</p> <p>It follows that I believe that the Plan should identify the 'probable' requirement for a vehicle bridge. Knowing that the Goring level crossing bypass bridge was 25 years in its planning with the necessary land 'reserved' by the Planning Process, I suggest similar land identification and reservation should be specified in our Neighbourhood Plan. Hopefully there may be better ideas than my suggested site for the vehicle bridge but I put forward my suggestion to start the debate. From the junction of Kingston Lane with North Lane vehicles would travel Kingston Lane eastwards until the lane curves south. At that point a new road curves northwards over the railway line and joins the A259 at the A280 roundabout. This new road should be of modest dimensions to limit speed and to discourage rat-runs into Rustington. My proposal does not pre-judge the eventual need and cost of such a bridge; it simply suggests we highlight the potential need and reserve the necessary land.</p> <p>I hope the above comments are helpful and would be happy to discuss the detail if that proves to be helpful.</p>	<p>The Parish Council is currently in consultation with the relevant bodies. These comments are not within the remit of the NP.</p>
013		<p>Dear Councillors: Thank you for sending the draft text for the EPNP. We would like to make the following points.</p> <p>The map on p.17 covers a slightly different area from the other maps shown and we would be obliged if you could confirm whether or not the beach huts at the end of South Strand come in the Parish of East Preston.</p> <p>Re page 22 iii and p.24 4.22 and 4.23 'Short term letting of dwellings': a person</p>	<p>Beach huts are in Kingston Parish.</p>

		<p>has bought a number of properties, some on the seafront, available to rent for up to 12 people. A number of parking spaces have also been procured and denied to other local people and we would be glad to know whether or not the Council supports these changes of use.</p> <p>Page 24 4.24: Whilst agreeing that roadside verges can be attractive, the existing Parish verges are cut so rarely as to look grossly untidy and unkempt and really show the village in a shabby state. If grass verges are to be encouraged we would be glad to see a better agreement with the responsible Department to ensure they are properly maintained.</p>	
014		<p>Hello Simon</p> <p>May I congratulate those members of the Council responsible for writing the Draft Plan. A very easy document to read, and very detailed. My only comment would be my concern at the reference to the Scout hut and Guide hut. This description is inaccurate as far as the Scouts and rather dismissive of the Guides, makes them sound insignificant to anyone who does not know the buildings.</p> <p>Congratulations again on a comprehensive document.</p>	Changed both to "Hall"
015		<p>Hullo Simon, just finished reading the Neighbourhood plan, you seem to have covered most things to keep the village as its always been a very nice place to live, in very pleased you mentioned the Busses coming down to the south end.</p>	No action
016		<p>re neighbourhood plan .I am surprised that the plan has no firm action plan for dealing with the parking problem at Fairlands bus stop. I have watched elderly and disabled passengers struggle to enter and exit buses in the middle of the road. I cant see why at the very least we cant have some yellow lines and signage to prevent parking at the bus stop.Most other places provide dedicated bus stands with raised kerbs to ease access It is not that we have only one bus aday there is one every 10 mins. in each direction.</p>	Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.

		<p>As a long term solution there is room on both sides of the road for a dedicated lay by.</p> <p>Fairlands is a timing point and busses are often stationary for several minutes which causes congestion especially when a bus arrives from the opposite direction.</p>	
17		<p>Proposal 6:- Access to beach, excellent idea. Could this be enlarged to incorporate “decking” either side of the access path to enable wheelchair/ mobility scooters to sit and view the seaview.</p> <p>Facilities for younger children are already excellent, the proposed addition of adult outdoor exercise equipment would be of great benefit.</p> <p>Yellow lines and busmarkings in fairlands would be necessary as would yellow lines on the Old Worthing Road due to cars parked on the bend (ref 5.19)</p>	<p>Consultations are on going</p>
018		<p>We had a look at the plan and have a few comments:</p> <p>1) We may have missed the statistic in the plan, but could not see where there is a reference to second homes/holiday homes? We lived in a block of flats near the beach when we first came down to EP and out of the 8 flats, 5 were second homes. Since we moved, we understand that this has changed, and now only 2 are second homes, However, it is known that there are many holiday homes in EP. This is a factor that should be addressed in the plan as at the moment it is an omission.</p> <p>2) Flats tend to lend themselves to become second homes and the more that are built, the more holiday homes will be in the parish.</p> <p>3) Retirement developments are normally reserved for the over 55. Again we cannot see reference to this in the plan but we may have missed it. There is no stopping the retirement home developers once they set their sites on building a development and if this happens in EP the demographic of the area could be affected.</p> <p>4) What seems strange is that we do not show the occupancy levels per unit area of the parish in the plan, perhaps using a grid system. For example, the private estates (such as Willowhayne) will have very few occupants per acre in</p>	<p>Mention inserted in 4.4, though detailed evidence unavailable.</p>

		<p>contrast to the family homes near Latchmere Rd. School.</p> <p>5) Should a house with large amount of land on the Willowhayne come up for development, would the council support the construction of say 4 homes where only one exists? I think we all know the answer is no, so should this not be mentioned in the plan? Should not the private estates be excluded from the plan and this made clear? This means the pressure to build is actually NOT on EP as a complete parish, but the limited land available outside the private estates.</p> <p>If we think of more we will forward details.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity.</p>	
19		<p>Dear Simon,</p> <p><u>Re: East Preston Neighbourhood Plan</u></p> <p>I have studied the draft plan.</p> <p>It is a first class piece of work and a very professional document.</p> <p>My few comments are set out below;</p> <p>1)“policy 2: design in Character Area One i. Preserve the street scene..”</p> <p>I note that “policy 5: design in Character Area Four has – i. preserve the street scene by retaining low front walls or open frontages; ii. Ensure that high front garden walls or fences are avoided.”</p> <p>Whilst I recognise that Character Area One covers a wide and varied area, taking in most of the Willowhayne and Angmering-on-Sea private estates, Seaview and Seafield roads, Sea Lane Close and most of Vicarage Lane, nonetheless, I would like to see this Policy strengthened, if possible, by setting down clear, additional guidelines for “preserving the street scene”. For example: “By ensuring that high front garden walls or high fences are avoided where they would diminish the overall appearance of the location and be out of keeping with</p>	

		<p>morning in the 1940s. “Our rooms were in the one-time stable block belonging to that institution, then converted to chalets for homeless families. Entering through a large pair of shabby green doors, we walked into a cobbled yard...”. He then describes their living accommodation and their desperate circumstances which continued until they moved to a farm in another part of Sussex in Spring. The “shabby green doors”, I believe, were the ones referred to above.</p> <p>This building, therefore has important historical associations and is a legacy of East Preston’s long association with the Workhouse story which began with its first and smaller Workhouse on the same site in the late 1700s and continued with the second one in 1873.</p> <p>III. Para 5.8</p> <p>My understanding is that the current Local List was finalised in 2005, not “some 20 years ago”.</p> <p>4) A minor point – “to” has been missed out at para 4.57, p.31, line 4, before “maintaining”.</p>	<p>The building has been too radically altered to be a candidate for addition to the Local List.</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>“to” added</p>
020		Six page document, attached as separate Appendix to this document.	The paragraphs regarding holiday lets has been redrafted to clarify (4.22).
021	Proposal 3: Sustainable Traffic & Transport	<p>Although a Rustington resident, I work and sometimes socialise in East Preston.</p> <p>Bulletpoint vi refers to alleviating problems caused by congestion in the village. At certain times of the day, congestion is caused in Worthing Road as a result of the Angmering station level crossing barriers being down as a 12-carriage eastbound train cannot fit on to the existing platform – the barriers stay down, northbound traffic gathers down Station Road, sometimes blocking exit from Worthing Road, so traffic backs up along there too.</p> <p>Network Rail has confirmed there is room to extend the eastbound platform into a 12-carriage platform, but there are too few 12-carriage trains to justify the expense.</p> <p>Perhaps this is something that could be added to paragraph 5.24 or as a separate paragraph somewhere.</p>	Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.

		Furthermore, should the bulletpoints at the top of Proposal 3 make reference to promoting proposals to encourage greater use of public transport and/or reduce the use of private transport, particularly cars.	
22		<p><u>East Preston Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation</u> Comments/ Queries.</p> <p><u>P16. 2.24</u> Saved policies of 2003 local plan. Q: It seems that Policy GEN 12 Parking in New Development has not been saved. If so, why not? (Appendix 2 Parking Standards is appropriate guide)</p> <p><u>P19. 3.3</u> Objectives 30 new homes built on <u>previously used land</u> Q: as it stands, “previously used land” is very much open to interpretation. eg – used as anything: building or green field or open land should be used “brownfield” site or on <u>previously developed land.</u></p> <p><u>P21 4.4</u> Level of Development Q: From my memory I think that at least 160 dwellings have been built between 2005/6 and 2011 alone - I don’t know how many 2001 to 2005/6. ? - 134 housing increase is less than what I would think. ?</p> <p><u>P23/24. 4.20</u> Parking Standards It appears that WSCC parking standards adopted, hence answers my query on GEN 12. My hunch is that WSCC standards are less than ADC. ?</p> <p><u>P27.</u> 4.33 Q: No. of dwellings 134? (see p21) 4.34 Do you know which sites have been identified to provide 13 dwellings? What sites are listed in SHLAA? 4.35 Q: other potential sites Are you sure 14-16 Worthing Road? Which site: new plan permission might give 8 units</p> <p><u>Queries</u> <u>P27/28</u> Policy 7 Open spaces The EPNP will resist proposals.....</p>	<p>GEN 12 has been saved</p> <p>See reference to adoption of WSCC parking standards (4.20-4.21)</p> <p>Reworded</p> <p>Data sources added to 4.4.</p>

It would be sensible to include as xi
Sea Road Caravan Site which was under 2003 Plan states “development for permanent residential use will not be permitted.” (under Policy DEV 37)(p76)
 It seems from 2.24 that this policy has not been saved!

P33.

Estimated no. of New Builds 2005 to

	New	Lost	Net
Sea Road/ Manor Road corner	21	-4	17
Nursery Close	23/ 25	0	23/ 25
Manor Road	3	0	3
Manor Road (each side of semis)	2	0	2
Manor Road Garage	?8	0	?8
Willowhayne Ave (adj. to roundabout)	1	0	1
South Strand (Garden dev. The cottage)	1	0	1
Sea Road (caravan park)	1	0	1
Sea Lane (garden dev. Adj. to Willowhayne Est. entrance)	1	0	1
23 Sea Lane (garden dev.)	1	0	1
- Sea Lane/ The Ridings	?2/3	-1	?2
Station Road (Milliers)	62/ 65	-	
Worthing Road (12-14)	12	-2	10
- Station Road (Kerria & Malveth) (north of Bradbury Hotel)	12	-2	10
Station Road/ Churchfields	14	-1	13
Willowhayne/ Parade (SE corner of Village Green)	4	0	4
Beechlands Close	4	0	4
Beechlands Close	4	0	4
170 or 175/180 North Lane (Garden dev. No. 61/71?)	1	0	1
North Lane (Garden dev. Around 71?)	1	0	1
Norris Cottages	2	0	1

See text of Policy 6 - omitted in the final NP. (SHLAA map was published in the State of the Parish Report - available online and in the Library)
 Policy 6 in the preSubmission Draft has been omitted from the Final NP.

See text of the now omitted Policy 6 re EP6 (in the SHLAA) The Open Dinghy Pen

Query no's built 2001 to 2005 ?
When was Mill Pond development?

Page 16 – Parking Policy of Arun GEN 12 should be included.

Page 19 – “previously used” should be “previously developed”

Page 21 – Housing numbers incorrect – have provided a schedule of the numbers developed between the years.

Estimated No of New Builds 2005 to 2011

	<u>New</u>	<u>Lost</u>	<u>Net</u>
Sea Rd/ Manor Rd corner	21	-4	17
Nursery Close	25	0	25
Manor Road (old car repair garage)	3	0	3
Manor Road (each side attached to Semi-D)	2	0	2
Willowhayne Ave (adj. to roundabout garden dev.)	1	0	1
South Strand (garden dev. – seaside cottage)	1	0	1
Sea Road (caravan park)	1	0	1
Sea Lane (garden dev. – Adj. to Willowhayne Est. entrance)	1	0	1
Sea Lane (No. 23 garden dev.)	1	0	1
Station Road (was Gerrard House)	68	-8	60
Worthing Road (was no's 16 & 18)	12	-2	10
Station Road (Churchfields)	14	-1	13
Willowhayne Ave/ Parade Mansions (SE corner Village Green)	4	0	4
Beechlands Close	4	0	4
Beechlands Close	4	0	4
North Lane (garden dev. Around 61/71)	1	0	1
North Lane (garden dev. around 75)	1	0	1

		<p>North Lane/ Norris Cottage 2 0 2 Manor Road Garage 8 0 8</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">174 -15 159</p> <p><u>Others from 2011</u> Station Rd/ Malvern/ Kerria 12 -2 10 Sea Lane (62)/ The Ridings (45) 3 -1 2 The Martletts 5 -1 4</p> <p><u>Before 2005</u> Crown Place 14 Mill Pond dev.</p>	
23		<p>All the accesses to the beach are messy and need improvement.</p> <p>Easy access should be provided for residents' friends and relatives.</p> <p>Parking - Sea Road Club Walk Access to greensward at Kingston Sea Lane</p>	Noted.
24		<p>Dear Simon,</p> <p>East Preston Neighbourhood Plan, Public Consultation</p> <p>On 10th February this year you wrote to us requesting our agreement to see the site of our house redeveloped to provide new housing and for the site to be listed in the Plan as a potential development site. The planning consent which has expired was for net gain of 10 units and extended over the sites of No XX Worthing Road. We agreed to its inclusion in the plan.</p> <p>However, we note on page 27 of the plan that the site is identified with the added</p>	Policy 6 in the preSubmission draft has been omitted from the final NP

		<p>comment <i>“A new planning permission under the policies of the Neighbourhood plan might provide a net gain of 8 units.”</i></p> <p>We note that the plan is required to identify a minimum of 30 units, but do not accept that a reduction of two units on our land is an appropriate way to reach that minimum target, if indeed it is necessary to do so. In fact there would be no chance of the land coming forward for redevelopment if only eight units were to be gained, as the scheme would not be financially viable.</p> <p>We would be perfectly happy to retain reference to the site in the Plan if the comment in italics above is removed from the plan. However, if this is not acceptable, we must regrettably ask for the inclusion or reference from the plan. However if this is not acceptable, we must regrettably ask for the inclusion or reference to nos. XX Worthing Road being listed as a site for potential development being removed from the plan entirely.</p>	
25		<p>Dear Simon,</p> <p>East Preston Neighbourhood Plan, Public Consultation</p> <p>On 10th February this year you wrote to us requesting our agreement to see the site of our house redeveloped to provide new housing and for the site to be listed in the Plan as a potential development site. The planning consent which has expired was for net gain of 10 units and extended over the sites of No XX Worthing Road. We agreed to its inclusion in the plan.</p> <p>However, we note on page 27 of the plan that the site is identified with the added comment <i>“A new planning permission under the policies of the Neighbourhood plan might provide a net gain of 8 units.”</i></p> <p>We note that the plan is required to identify a minimum of 30 units, but do not accept that a reduction of two units on our land is an appropriate way to reach that minimum target, if indeed it is necessary to do so. In fact there would be no chance of the land coming forward for redevelopment if only eight units were to be gained, as the scheme would not be financially viable.</p> <p>We would be perfectly happy to retain reference to the site in the Plan if the</p>	<p>Policy 6 in the preSubmission draft has been omitted from the final NP</p>

		comment in italics above is removed from the plan. However, if this is not acceptable, we must regrettably ask for the inclusion or reference from the plan. However if this is not acceptable, we must regrettably ask for the inclusion or reference to nos. XX Worthing Road being listed as a site for potential development being removed from the plan entirely.	
26		<p>Dear Simon,</p> <p><i>Re East Preston Neighbourhood Plan</i></p> <p>First let me commend the authors for a sterling body of work! Well done. There is little I disagree with, but would like to add some comments.</p> <p>P.15 – Opportunities for the EPNP – I have expressed concerns already about the number of late night venues which are operating at the lower end of Sea Road beyond The Green – currently 3 pubs and, since the Seaview Café has now started opening ‘til midnight, there are also 3 restaurants. This is a largely residential area, already disturbed by numbers of taxis and pick-up vehicles arriving after 11pm, as well as carousing of “clients” of the above establishments wending their way up Sea Road and its environs. Police have been involved on a number of occasions, and I feel unless restrictions on further opening of such businesses are put in place, EP could be seen as a good place to go for late night drinking by folk from neighbourhoods other than East Preston.</p> <p>P.19 – Vision offers some reassurance about the need to maintain the community – with responsible development and to remain a coastal village, and P.20 – mentions economic, social and environmental issues – late night disturbance is very much a social issue, and I would think it to be incompatible with a community in a coastal village. By all means aim to increase business, P.31 – 4.54 but not with late night opening.</p> <p>P.24 – 4.22/23 – Walking around the coastal areas it is obvious that several houses are either second homes, which may be let out at times to visitors, or are being totally converted to holiday lets, sometimes using large houses, which could encourage noisy disturbances in and around the area in which they are situated. These could have provided several homes for permanent residents. I fell restrictions such as these suggested on this sort of development are necessary to prevent EP becoming seen as a ghost town when out of season.</p>	Holiday lets paragraphs redrafted. (4.22)

		<p>P.31 – 4.56 I do hope indoor provision for a Youth meeting place can be found, as it is important, particularly in bad weather, for young people to be able to meet and socialise under supervision, to provide them with activities they might not necessarily be able to afford otherwise.</p> <p>4.58 – I also welcome the possible provision of outdoor equipment. I have seen this type of equipment in Hove Park, and it does seem well used by all ages, presumably to the benefit of their health.</p>	
27		<p>Hello - I have been reading the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and am generally very impressed.</p> <p>However I do have one concern.</p> <p>Reference: Rail Crossing, page 36 5.20</p> <p>while I understand the possible need for a footbridge (I would sooner have seen the footpath crossing stay open) I am concerned about the visual impact the bridge may have. I have recently been to Chichester and used a new footbridge that has been installed to the West of the station, in place of a perfectly servicable footpath crossing. Quite frankly the bridge is huge, with no redeeming features at all. A similar one at roundstone would be a complete eyesore. Will there be a choice of design if this plan is implemented?</p> <p>Well done on the rest of the plan</p>	<p>Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.</p>
28		<p>We have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and would like to comment on one item in particular. I refer you to Points 4.22 and 4.23 on Page 24.</p> <p>The State of The Parish Report of January 2014 states:</p> <p><i>“ Tourism</i></p> <p>3.38 The parish is mainly a residential area with few facilities for visitors to stay. <u>There are, however, an increasing number of properties available for holiday lets, continuing an historic pattern in the village</u>, where there are still some second homes not occupied throughout the year. “</p>	<p>Paragraph on holiday lets redrafted (4.22)</p>

		<p>Such historic pattern needs to continue with the <i>furnished holiday lets</i> at the higher end of the market bringing family orientated clients to this beautiful part of the Sussex coast. We have experienced no nuisance, noise or behaviour and the need for extra security of these prestigious properties has led to a decrease in the incidents of vandalism in the area.</p> <p>Despite the fears of The Angmering-on-Sea Estate Residents Association Ltd. there have been few, if any, parking problems despite the imposition of Parking Restrictions imposed in the absence of any West Sussex County Council Traffic Regulation Orders. In fact there seems to be a witch hunt going on around there – on New Year’s Day we went over to collect our cars from the car park that used to belong to the Bella Vista – as we had attended a private New Year’s Eve party and were stunned to find they had been issued unlawfully with parking tickets! This party had provided a local restaurant with a lot of business.</p> <p>The holiday lets all provide jobs for a lot of local people. Not to mention extra business for local shops and restaurants. Property investors will also be deterred from investing and buying property in our lovely, quintessential seaside villages. Today I noticed yet another empty shop in Rustington.</p> <p>Therefore we strongly believe that furnished holiday lets should retain their status quo in respect of planning requirements.</p>	
29		<p>Hi Simon,</p> <p>I noted that the cricket club [Warren Recreation Ground] is not mentioned as an asset of community value. Is there a reason for this?</p> <p>No wonder you have been busy!</p>	Already protected.
30		<p>I read the NP with interest and very much agree with the contents of the plan. However, I have to say that I am not convinced that much will be achieved by all the hard work that has clearly gone into its production.</p> <p>With regard to local developments, my experience to date is that no matter how much local residents and parish councils object, the plans are normally driven</p>	No action.

		<p>through by powerful developers.</p> <p>For example, it is a fact that despite local objections (including Arun DC) planning permission was granted in Sea Road for the demolition of four perfectly good bungalows to make way for the erection of apartments. I believe the Appeal Inspector did not consider East Preston as a stand alone village but part of the conurbation stretching westwards from Worthing to Littlehampton.</p> <p>Furthermore, the wording expressed in Development Principles, section 4.11 (page 23) has certainly been ignored with regard to the new development in Seafield Road that bears no resemblance to its surrounding buildings. It is a “kit” house and its appearance is totally out of keeping with neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The same happened with a proposed development in the garden at 5 Sea Lane Close where despite local objections, permission was granted to build a small block of apartments even though the plans were totally out of keeping with the local area.</p> <p>There was also a consultation with local residents as what should happen to the bungalow on the Martlets land i.e. open space, public garden or a facility for the East Preston community. The next thing we know is that planning permission for housing is being sought from Arun District Council so once again it appears that the concerns of local people have just been ignored.</p> <p>I am sorry to be so pessimistic about the likely impact of the plan but when I look back and recall some of the awful planning decisions, I find it difficult to believe that anything will change on planning issues following the acceptance and publication of this NP.</p>	
31		<p>Simon,</p> <p>This is a response to consultation on the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>This is a skilfully prepared document. Unfortunately, it is rather a challenge to read and appreciate. Quite right that it should be circulated to all households, but in truth it is not likely to be read fully by many.</p> <p>As with such documents the key elements drop out gradually and are highlighted</p>	

		<p>in bold. There is a need for an executive type summary or even a listing at the front of the document of the policies and proposals. Perhaps this happens in due course in support of the local referendum, but by then it is too late to change. I would like to suggest that some form of summary is published in the EP Parish newsletter.</p> <p>5.20 Change “could” to “should”. Closure is at this time very much a current issue with the path being closed on 24 May 2014. Depending on the steps taken to ensure full closure one does hope that some youngster doesn’t circumvent the arrangement and become a casualty. A bridge would encourage proper crossing of this railway line.</p>	Change made
32		<p>I am happy with the contents of the Plan and of the way it is expressed, but I would suggest possible minor changes, as detailed below:</p> <p><u>On page 11, in paragraph 2.5. it says:</u></p> <p><i>2.5 With regard to services and business, the parish contains a variety of shops and approximately 160 businesses as well as an Infants School, Junior School, parish churches as well as numerous community, sports and cultural organisations and groups.</i></p> <p>The repetition of “as well as” sounds a little clumsy; perhaps “together with” could be substituted for the second use of this phrase?</p> <p>Surely there is only one <u>parish</u> church in the parish (i.e. St Mary’s), though there are several churches and places of worship.</p> <p><u>On page 31, in paragraph 4.57 it says:</u></p> <p><i>4.57 WSCC will be withdrawing their support for the Youth Club at the end of March 2014, and letting out the building in the schools campus, at present used in the Youth Club.</i></p> <p>Should “in the Youth Club” be “by the Youth Club”?</p>	<p>“parish” omitted</p> <p>“together with” substituted</p> <p>Noted - changed</p>

33		<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Many thanks for the opportunity to join in on the village proposal plan.</p> <p>We have lived in the village for 42 years and have enjoyed living here, but we feel that with so many of our roads being used by cars and delivery vans, a 20 mph speed limit through the village should be implemented.</p> <p>Also we feel that the park area in Sea Road should also have a crossing constructed, as often when we take our granddaughter there it is open to the road and is very dangerous to cross.</p> <p>We notice because the park shares a car park area there are no barriers, and children can, and do, run across Sea Road. I think that with two crossings, one by the park area, and one in the village area, this would also reduce the speed of the vehicles</p>	<p>Outside NP scope. Currently under review by WSCC..</p>
34		<p>Hi Simon</p> <p>Having re-read the plan, it is apparent that the Warren Recreation Ground and its facilities are not included in the list of Assets of Community Value (Section 5.3; proposal 1). I should therefore like to ask the council to consider adding the following to that list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warren Recreation Ground generally, but also more specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cricket square and outfield ○ Cricket pavilion ○ Cricket practice nets ○ Tennis court <p>I do appreciate that the Warren Recreation Ground is mentioned in Policy 7 – open spaces, at point iv, but there is no mention of the cricket facilities (or tennis court). There are vague references to “games” and “organised sports” in paragraph 4.37, but again they omit any reference to cricket, which is of concern to me as a parish resident of long standing, and also to the cricket club as a community group.</p>	<p>Already protected under Rev Warren's will</p>

35	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and would like to comment on a couple of paragraphs therein. I refer you to Points 4.22 and 4.23 on Page 24.</p> <p>The State of The Parish Report of January 2014 stated:</p> <p><i>“ Tourism</i></p> <p>3.38 The parish is mainly a residential area with few facilities for visitors to stay. <u>There are, however, an increasing number of properties available for holiday lets, continuing an historic pattern in the village</u>, where there are still some second homes not occupied throughout the year. “</p> <p>Such historic pattern needs to continue with the <i>furnished holiday lets</i> at the higher end of the market bringing family orientated clients to this beautiful part of the Sussex coast. Some of these visitors fall in love with the area and return to live, thereby contributing to a strong property market and the modernisation of many older properties.</p> <p>I have experienced no nuisance, noise or bad behaviour and the need for extra security of these prestigious properties has led to a decrease in the incidents of vandalism in the area. For example in the area of the South Strand car park near to the former Bella Vista restaurant, youths frequently used to congregate in cars late in the evenings, playing loud music and according to some younger residents, taking substances. Due to a security presence, such activities have now entirely ceased with this car park finally feeling safe place to walk through in the hours of darkness.</p> <p>Despite the paranoia of The Angmering-on-Sea Estate Residents Association Ltd. there have been few, if any, parking issues during the last 12 months, despite the imposition of Parking Restrictions imposed in the absence of any West Sussex County Council Traffic Regulation Orders.</p> <p>I have spoken to a number of local business owners and all have agreed that the influx of ‘out-of-towners’ adds considerably to the viability of their businesses. Guests of <i>furnished holiday lets</i> are naturally far more likely to eat and drink out regularly during their stay than local residents and also to use the local village stores to top up on any missing items from their supermarket shop. The turn</p>	Holiday lets paragraph redrafted (4.22)
----	---	---

		<p>round at the end of a holiday let requires such activities as cleaning of the properties, laundering and ironing of bed linen, minor repairs, window cleaning, gardening etc. and a dedicated local work force is required. This and the variety of jobs created for local people can only improve the local economy.</p> <p>I therefore believe that these <i>furnished holiday lets</i> should retain their status quo in respect of planning requirements, they are not houses which encroach on neighbours and therefore do not pose a problem. The inclusion of points 4.22 and 4.23 is, in my opinion, very short sighted in what is a significant long-term plan for our local area and these points should be removed at the end of the current consultation process.</p>	
36		<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I have read with interest the neighbourhood plan, and have the following observations/comments to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) As I walk around East Preston (EP) I see a great diversity of house building styles and sizes, which is part of the charm. I don't see why new houses should be built as a pastiche of what is surrounding them as I am a believer in high quality modern design, perhaps with references to the past (which in EP seems to be 1920s/1930s to my mind). 2) I would strongly encourage parking not to be reduced by development. Many of the new extensions locally appear to have been built over side of the house parking, and adequate parking should be found. 3) I do not believe there should be a limit of two stories on developments, the newly proposed house on the Greensboard is an indication of how 3rd stories when used sensitively, can heighten and improve substantially the style of a building. I believe these measures need to be in proportion – building a three story block next to Bungalows in a tight space would perhaps look odd but most large houses have large eaves which extend seemingly higher than the third story of a flat roofed design. 4) I do not agree that extensions should always look like the original design of the house – if one lived in a flint small windowed property I think both the property and the extension would benefit from a much lighter handed, deft approach to creating space. I think this is a principle long established by leading architects and indeed encouraged by conservation authorities so that one can tell where the old house ends. 5) Flatly stating that new entrances should be unobstrusive seems to me to 	<p>3), 4), 5) Most of the respondents to the surveys and community consultations that have taken place, and which have guided the drawing up of this Neighbourhood Plan, would not agree.</p>

		<p>be the wrong way to approach, some houses need distinct entrances to create a more welcoming facade. I personally find “hidden doors” around the side of the house very unappealing and also not to be good for the prevention of crime and community general wellbeing.</p> <p>6) I would encourage the planting of medium sized trees in new developments so as to “ground” the developments better, and encourage wildlife and weather protection.</p>	
37		<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I have now reviewed your Neighbourhood Plan and please consider my comments below in reference to Points 4.22 and 4.23 on Page 24.</p> <p>I would like to question if those considering this policy change have come across a website called Sussex by the Sea. This website is designed to attract tourists to all areas of West Sussex including East Preston. A website set up by the tourist offices of Arundel, Bognor and Littlehampton that recommends self catering property in West Sussex including properties in East Preston, these very same properties you are trying to ban.</p> <p>There is a second website is www.arundel.org.uk - and to quote from this site under the section "places to stay" it is written "Visiting such a beautiful town on the south coast, with so much to do and plenty of other glorious countryside and sites to visit nearby, you'll want a base to stay the night and to venture out. Whether you want to stay within the town itself or nearby, we have a healthy list of places to stay. Take a look at the pages in our accommodation section above. You will find details of locations in and around Arundel for all budgets and including hotels, B&Bs, caravans, camping, self-catering, youth hostels and retirement accommodation."</p> <p>So if you succeed in preventing holiday lets in EP this site will need to be changed to say that one of the beautiful coastal towns is East Preston but you won't be allowed to stay there as the recent neighbourhood plan has made sure tourists can't stay in our beautiful village as we are so elite we don't want them.</p> <p>Does the Councillor in this plan actually understand the definition of a furnished</p>	<p>Paragraph regarding holiday lets has been redrafted (4.22)</p>

	<p>let? Is he aware they are not illegal in the UK and such lets fall under the category of "ancillary use" to the property if they are used as a single household. Perhaps I should elaborate on the definition of Single household - It is a household that consists of one or more people who live in the same dwelling and also share at meals or living accommodation, and may consist of a single family or some other grouping of people. (The household is the basic unit of analysis in many social, microeconomic and government models, and is important to the fields of economics.) For example In feudal times, the royal Household and medieval households of the wealthy would also have included servants and other retainers.</p> <p>For statistical purposes in the United Kingdom, a household is defined as "one person or a group of people who have the accommodation as their only or main residence and for a group, either share at least one meal a day or share the living accommodation, that is, a living room or sitting room".</p> <p>So if East Preston were to become a neighbourhood which prevented holiday letting in its boundaries where would this leave the rest of the UK? Would other villages also want to be elite in their self perseveration of what they consider was their village and prevent others from entering the village and sharing a destination. How would that work with Government policy of promoting tourism which benefits our economy? Do East Preston councillors really feel we are so important we can re write UK law and have our own little area protected area where tourists /foreigners are not welcome? because this is what your policy would mean. Are we really wanting to say we are so important in East Preston that we are electing to prevent anyone else bar our own enjoying the area of the UK that we live in? What if the rest of the UK were to follow suit? Where would that leave the tourist industry and our economy? Or does it not matter as it would only be East Preston who would be allowed to do this?</p> <p>And thus those that benefit from the tourist industry that has been active in our village since records began ie the restaurants, pubs, shops, taxi firms and the numerous other amenities such as tradesman, cleaners, gardeners and builders that are needed to service this industry are not considered important in this grand scheme of protecting our village? Surely adding to our local economy and increasing its wealth via these amenities is more important than creating an elitist exclusion zone around our village.</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>It needs to be remembered that historically Angmering on Sea was one of the first villages to start holiday letting back in 1750 and this is now a UK wide pursuit. To change a part of the UK and prevent holiday letting in East Preston because we feel the village is "special" and should be "protected from tourists" is not just unrealistic, it is elitist and could cause unimaginable problems our village a target of a hatred campaign from the rest of the UK and so risk the one thing you are trying to protect.</p> <p>The Councillor trying to introduce this policy should bear heed to those before him who are so hated they have had move to abroad to escape the scorn of the English.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing the neighbourhood plan moves forward excluding these ridiculous points.</p>	
38		<p>Dear Simon I fully support the proposals in the plan. Thank the council members for their hard work in drawing up the plan.</p> <p>There are a few proposals that I would personally like to see:</p> <p>Proposal 3: Sustainable Traffic and Transport Access to the Parish 5.19 : A dedicated lane from the East towards East Preston and double yellow lines on the bend would be a good start but I feel there is a need to extend the double yellow lines as far as the railway crossing. Many cars park on the left which reduces visibility and causes the queuing traffic to be too far to the right. Cars leaving the station car park and turning right and those cars overtaking the line of traffic in order to get to the station car park or the roads on the right are in danger of causing a collision when the barriers are down.</p> <p>Public Transport 5.2: A later Stagecoach 700 evening bus service in westerly direction would be extremely useful and would reduce car use from Brighton and Worthing.</p> <p>The reinstatement of a bus service to the southern part of the Parish would help the elderly and disabled who find it difficult to walk to Fairlands.</p>	<p>Outside NP scope. Comment passed to EPPC for review.</p>

		<p>Late evening trains and from London and Gatwick are needed. At the moment people have to drive to Worthing if they can't leave London early.</p> <p>Congestion and Parking 5.25: I would also add that parking needs to be addressed along Sea Lane by the Bowls Club. It is getting more and more difficult to negotiate the bend on Sea Lane because of the number of parked cars on both sides of the road. It is especially dangerous where the road narrows when driving towards the sea.</p> <p>Thank you for all your efforts.</p>	
39		<p>Dear Mr Cross,</p> <p>I am writing with some feedback on the East Preston Neighbourhood plan, distributed to local homes at the start of the month. I can see that a lot of work has gone in to the development of the EP NP, and I really appreciate this. I am, however, writing to object to both the apparent intent and the legal accuracy of the section on Short Term Letting of Dwellings (4.22 and 4.23).</p> <p>Firstly, in my reading of this section I sense an underlying sentiment that holiday lets are bad for East Preston, and a problem that needs to be eradicated. I would strongly suggest that this is not the case. While no one wants stag parties next door every weekend (and if this is a real problem then you should absolutely consider options to curtail it), families coming to stay for a week in the summer, or a even for the weekend is a positive boost for the community and particularly for local businesses.</p> <p>Secondly, section 4.23 is very misleading and wholly legally inaccurate. That a property is let for short period absolutely does not on its own constitute a material change of use. There are cases where holiday letting may constitute a change of use but these are the exception, and the duration of lets is certainly not the deciding factor.</p> <p>Let me take my circumstances as an example .. rededicated. My family and I use it exactly for its original intended purpose: for weekends and longer holidays with our family and friends. We also let it out as a short term holiday let from time to time when we are not using it ourselves. I believe that these short term lets are a net positive for everyone involved. As well as contributing to the cost of</p>	<p>Paragraph on holiday lets has been redrafted to clarify (4.22)</p>

		<p>maintaining this important historic building, it provides improved public access to an important building whose value cannot be appreciated from the street; it also means that it is occupied for more of the year, which is positive for the community and means more money spent at the local shops and restaurants. This directly supports one of the headline opportunities you cite for the EPNP in section 2.20. Those we let to are using the house just like we do and consulting relevant case law it is perfectly clear that these circumstances do not constitute a material change of use from C3 dwelling use.</p> <p>I am also slightly confused by the role of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council on this topic. From my very limited reading on the matter (I am no expert), it seems to me that the Parish Council does have duties and powers to encourage tourism, but while they should be notified of all planning applications, all planning decisions are made at District and County Council level. It seems odd therefore that this plan is seeking to interpret planning law on this topic (erroneously I believe in this instance), while making no mention (positive or negative) of tourism in the area (the word does not appear in the document).</p> <p>Of course if there is consistent feedback from residents on particular holiday let properties that cause a major nuisance (like stag parties every weekend!) then the residents have my complete sympathy and support, and together with the Parish and District Council should absolutely look at what powers they have to stop this. I suggest that this should happen independently of the Neighbourhood Plan though, and that the answer is certainly not the two paragraphs currently included in the document.</p> <p>If the Steering Group think this is really a topic that should be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan then I suggest seeking legal advice on the matter, and presenting legally accurate and well-balanced guidance. I would respectfully suggest, however, that that effort would be better spent on developing policies in conjunction with local businesses on what kind of tourism they would like to encourage in the village, and how this might be achieved.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	
40		<p>With reference to the Neighbourhood Plan.. I have some comments reference Policies & Proposals</p>	

	<p><u>With reference to Designs in Character areas 1-4</u></p> <p>Can I bring to your attention that the majority of the main roads into this lovely Village have been classed under Character areas 3 and 4. Which allows redevelopment and apartment blocks etc etc. Tighter building control is needed along these routes as this is what every Villager sees on the way in or out of the Village as well as Visitors. As we all know only to well 1st impressions last. Lets be proud of all of our Village not just the private estates!</p> <p><u>POLICY 10 Access To The Beach</u></p> <p>This is something I feel strongly about. I have a young disabled son, who uses a Kaye walker and a wheelchair. We are currently unable to access our own local beach, as wheelchairs and the beach do not mix.</p> <p>This should not be just about accessing the beach but there should also be an area so people can stop to enjoy the beach . Maybe sit with a Carer or family members and enjoy the beautiful views. Maybe even a sheltered area and at the same time why not have an "accessible" toilet using the Radar scheme. Then only people with a Radar key would be able to access it cutting down on the risk of Vandalism. Seeing as the Village does not have any disabled/accessible facilities within it, the provision of such would be an excellent facility for Villagers and a selling point to Visitors.</p> <p>We currently have to go to Worthing to enjoy the Beach and Facilities.</p> <p>On a Health and Safety point of view "Decking" when wet is dangerous so particularly hazardous for people with impaired mobility. Concrete or Tarmac would be a safer option however block paving would be better Environmentally but has its own safety issues if not laid correctly. Please could Carers and Disabled persons be consulted on this issue and the actual location of this "access to the beach" as it also has a knock on effect with parking etc.</p> <p>Also not every disabled person is "old".</p>	<p>Text has been redrafted.</p> <p>Consultations are ongoing, and the word "decking" has been replaced by "platform"</p>
--	---	--

		Many thanks for reading my opinions I await your response.	as no detailed decisions have yet been made.
41		<p>Dear Simon</p> <p>I wish to comment on the section "Parking Standards" numbered 4.20 to 4.21</p> <p>As no doubt many people have commented on before, on-road parking is becoming a nightmare in East Preston. In the report it says "the provision of parking space in the new development is determined by the 2010 adopted WSCC Standards".</p> <p>I should be interested to know what the standard is: it does not provide realistic parking for each residence.</p>	Parish Council to respond
42		<p>Thank you for East Preston Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Referring to page 25. Policy 3 Design in Character Area Two.</p> <p>11. Basic form of the roof is not altered. My neighbour No 15, has had windows back of bungalow sticking right out, a right eyesore, at certain times of day blocking light in roof of my conservatory. I inquired at Council Offices – was told you can do that now, you don't have to have Plans Submitted, or Neighbours told, so does that mean this work is not inspected now.!</p> <p>I paid a surveyor to look at a previous job he did & was told he has come marginally over my Part Wall Line as I am elderly will this affect my selling at a later date as this is semi detached.</p> <p>Thanking you.</p>	No action
43		Hi Simon	No action

		<p>I noticed in Angmering's NP more detail on parking so my comment is:</p> <p>Reference to para 4.20 on page 23 of EPNP Is it permissible to include more specific requirements on parking as in para 6.30 page 51of Angmering's NP?</p>	
44		<p>Dear Mr. Cross</p> <p>Representations to Pre-Submission draft EP Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Thank you for allowing..... the opportunity for responding to draft East Preston Neighbourhood Plan. We support the principle of a local development plan for the village by promoting sustainable development and protecting the existing character of the area.</p> <p>You have the letter of 25th April 2014 from....., allocated as an approved development site, given it has been granted planning permission for 4 x 2 bedroom dwellings on 26th March 2008 (Planning reference: EP/.....).</p> <p>Policy 1 – Housing and General Principles</p> <p>We support this policy and consider the extant planning permission at conforms to Part 1-iv of the Policy regarding material considerations set out especially; appropriate scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials.</p> <p>Request Amendment to Policy 6, paragraph 4.35</p> <p>We request that the updated draft EPNP recognise that part of the site at (Planning ref: EP/....) <u>is included within Policy 6 'Location of Development' and listed within paragraph 4.35 under 'other potential development sites'</u>. This accords with EPNP meeting its housing targets set by Arun District Council's Local Plan to provide a minimum of 30 dwellings over the next 15 years. The site has existing planning consent with a potential capacity for 4 new dwelling houses and indeed has a greater planning status and certainty of delivery than other sites identified within the draft EPNP on page 27. For example, xxxx , which does not yet have planning permission.</p> <p>Request Amendment to Policy 2: Design in Character Area One</p>	

	<p>We request further clarification and detail regarding the definition of Policy 2, Part ii regarding `avoid apartment blocks of flats and other large or tall buildings`. The policy appears to resist this building typology, however we consider it too wide a generalisation for this housing category and more detailed guidance on this should be set out by the Plan. For example, a new large family dwelling house of 4 bedroom (+) with garden if proposed could fall foul of this Policy and arguably not conform with Part ii. Is that the intention? I suspect not.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no prevailing design typology that covers Character Area 1 and this should be recognised within redrafted policy acknowledging that there is a mix of dwelling types existing across the area. Equally no further guidance is given on height and appearance within Design Character Area 1 which the site at) was sensitively designed to a high quality with appropriate mass, scale, height and visual appearance that respected the existing village character. This was supported by the Planning Inspector in his decision where he concluded with reference to East Preston Village Design Statement (2008) that the extant proposal “ would not be harmful to character of the area because it would be of a scale and appearance that would be compatible with its surrounding.”</p> <p>Yet draft Policy 2 4.26 quoted as saying “Large buildings, such as blocks of flats or hotels should not be permitted”. The draft Policy seems overtly opposed to `large` buildings without defining the scale. For example, is this a 2 storey or 4 storey building. We request this is clarified. Additionally, the definition of a `block of flats` is also vague and offers no guidance rather than a blanket resistance, which may not conform to the Arun District Local Plan. It also does not recognise that high quality and sensitively designed apartments and flats may indeed meet the tests of Policy 1 Part i in the first instance. Further inconsistency would occur when considering overarching `Development Principles` set out in paragraph 4.11 and paragraph 4.17 explained within Policy 1 (Page 21).</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We welcome the support the overall principles of the draft EPNP, however request amendment to Policy 6 regarding inclusion of the site at and further clarification on the details on Policy 2 which appear to be currently unclear and inconsistent with the rest of the plan and potentially Arun District Local Plan.</p> <p>We look forward to further engagement with East Preston Parish Council on the draft EPNP in consultation and co-ordination with planners from Arun District Council.</p>	<p>Policy 6 in the preSubmission draft has been omitted from the final NP</p> <p>Policy 2 has been reworded to clarify.</p>
--	---	---

		Yours sincerely	
45		<p>Policy 9 : Sustainable Drainage (p.29)</p> <p>The Flood Working Party requires the following wording (in red) to be substituted for 4.45 :-</p> <p>The need to manage this risk was highlighted by the two events of localised flooding in the parish during 2012 when some residents in Sea Lane had to leave their homes. Since then much work has been carried out by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) which has undertaken CCTV surveys, cleaned the surface w3ater pipe and gullies, as well as undertaking major works to the outfall and ditch, and to the surface water pipe in the highway.</p> <p>Proposal 2 : Heritage Assets (p.34)</p> <p>iv. Parade Mansions – Should read “The Parade/Parade Mansions”. Reason : <i>The Parade</i> refers to the shops, and <i>Parade Mansions</i> are the flats (above the shops) which were provided solely for the shopkeepers.</p> <p>viii. Change “<i>The Hollies</i>, Station Road” to read “The Hollies, Worthing Road”.</p> <p>Proposal 1 Assets to the community (p.33)</p> <p>i. Conservative Hall, Sea Road</p> <p>ii. Youth Centre, Lashmar Road</p> <p>v. Angmering-on-Sea Lawn Tennis Club</p> <p>vi. East Preston & Kingston Bowls Club grounds and premises</p> <p>vii. Guide Hut, Lashmar Road</p> <p>ix. East Preston & Kingston Village Hall, Sea Road</p> <p>x. Grounds of East Preston Infants and East Preston Junior Schoos</p> <p>Policy 7 (p. 28)</p> <p>iii. Playing fields, Lashmar Road – to read “Lashmar Recreation Ground”</p> <p>iv. Warren Recreation Ground and Two Acres, Sea Road</p> <p>v. Village Green, Sea Road</p> <p>vii. Angmering-on-Sea Lawn Tennis Club, The Nookery</p> <p>viii. East Preston & Kingston Bowls Club, Sea Lane</p>	<p>Wording changed</p> <p>Changes made</p> <p>Map used as captioned.</p>

	<p>Proposal 2 : Heritage Assets (p.34) i. Far End (built 1887) and Brockhurst (built 1907), Sea Lane</p> <p>iii. Boatman’s Cottage, 121 Sea Road (part of the Kingston Coastguard Station)</p> <p>5.8 Re-surveying the buildings in the parish Reason : The Street and Sea Lane are outside of the village area.</p> <p>5.12 The Parade and Parade Mansions in Sea Road was built in 1921-1922 by Angmering-on-Sea Ltd., the development company founded by William Hollis to serve the Angmering-on-Sea Estate. Reason : The shops were to serve the very wealthy residents of the exclusive and private community that lived, or had second homes, on the Angmering-on-Sea Estate.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Correct 6th line ... apex. It has three storeys ...</p> <p>Additional item</p> <p>Planning Policy Context : Arun Local Plan 2003-2011 East Preston (p. 17)</p> <p>Map with caption "<i>Plan B : 2003 Local Plan Proposals Map – East Preston inset</i>"</p> <p>1. Shouldn't this caption say : "Plan B : The parish of East Preston (Extract from Arun's 2003 Local Plan Proposals" ?</p> <p>What does "inset" mean ? Should it be "insert" ?</p> <p>2. It is important that this maps shows East Preston's parish boundary eg. highlighted in yellow so that other information eg. cycle tracks are still visible.</p> <p>Reason for boundary : The boundary identifies the location of the two Conservation Areas which are shared with the parishes of Rustington and Kingston. Without the map, the current text is confusing.</p>	<p>Change(not changed: ground floor shops, first floor, then two storeys in the mansard roof, as outlined in teThe caption is as it was originally published</p> <p>This map is the one from the saved 2003 Local Plan, therefore cannot be altered.</p>
--	---	--

46	<p><u>Objectives & Measures</u> 3.3a you're not saying what the maximum amount of housing for the village will be over the next fifteen years</p> <p><u>Policies & Proposals:</u> 4.5 Arun District Council Is now starting to build affordable housing again</p> <p><u>Policy 7:</u> iv It should be noted that the Warren Recreation Ground, Two Acres and the Village Hall belong to the people of the village, and theh Pairhs Council is only custodians for the people. This cannot be developed without 75% of the villagers agreeing and any profits from the agreed sale have to be divided between all the villagers.</p> <p><u>Policy 10 Beach Access:</u> 4.5 It would be better if the Parish Council supported access to the beach from Sea Lane, as parking can be by the foot path that already exists and leads to the beach. All that would have to be done is to provide a concrete (not decking, extremely unsafe when wet) area at the end of the path for disabled people to view the beach.</p>	<p>A NP cannot specify a maximum, as the NPPF states that there is a presumption in favour of development in the built up area.</p> <p>Incorrect. Parish Council is the trustee of the WRG and is governed by Charity Commission rules.</p> <p>As consultations are ongoing, no detailed decisions have yet been made."</p>
----	--	---