



# EAST PRESTON PARISH COUNCIL

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

Tel: 01903 770050

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

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

## **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES:** of the Committee Meeting held on Tuesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2019 at Council Office, 122 Sea Road, East Preston at 09:30hrs

**MEMBERS** Councillors C Bowman, D Moore, G Mathias (Chairman) and S Wilkinson

**PRESENT:**

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

Mrs S Vos, East Preston & Kingston Preservation Society

Ms G

**ABSENT:** Councillors E Linton and S Toney

---

The meeting opened at 18:00.

### **360/19 APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE**

An apology and a reason for absence were received from Cllrs Linton (away) and Toney (work).

### **361/19 PERSONAL AND/OR PREJUDICIAL/PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

Cllr Mathias declared a Personal Interest in Planning Application, EP/36/19/HH, as a fellow resident of the Willowhayne private estate.

(Ms G arrived at this point in the meeting.)

### **362/19 PUBLIC SESSION**

Ms G said she was present and willing to answer any questions committee members had about her Planning Application for 9 Myrtle Grove, EP/36/19/HH.

### **363/19 ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL (ADC) PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The committee considered the following Planning Applications:

#### Observations by 5<sup>th</sup> May 2019

<b>EP/36/19/HH</b>	Change of pitched roofs to full gable roofs, new mono-pitch dormers to front & rear elevations on main dwelling, new gate, posts & fence to front of property site & change of existing annexe roof to split mono-pitch roof. 9 Myrtle Grove, East Preston, BN16 2SW
--------------------	---

Mrs Vos advised the meeting the Preservation Society would be objecting to this Application on the grounds of its design and its choice of colours for materials. The Preservation Society Chairman believed the Application would breach Policy 4 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and Policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan as the proposal does not fit in with the style of surrounding buildings. Mrs Vos explained the Preservation Society would prefer clay roof tiles from a terracotta palette rather than the monochrome effect a grey slate would give. The upwards angling of the dormers north and south were unusual and not to everyone's taste, but that aside, the proposed dormers were not subservient to the existing roofline. Mrs Vos believed the property could be seen from Vicarage Lane, which was why yellow notices had been placed in Vicarage Lane.

No public representations about this Application had been received.

Ms G explained the property could not be seen from the road, only from the properties it immediately bordered. Ms G had discussed the proposal with neighbours who had not raised any objections.

The committee AGREED unanimously to support the Preservation Society's objections to this Application: i.e. the proposed dormers are not subservient to the existing roofline and the choice of colours is out-of-keeping with the existing streetscene. The committee AGREED the proposed design was unsympathetic and would have an unacceptable impact upon the character of the immediate locality, contrary to the Arun Local Plan and the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan. As the committee believed the proposal was contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan, it believed it had little option but to object.

Ms G asked for a copy of the Minutes once they were available.

#### Observations by 12<sup>th</sup> May 2019

**EP/40/19/A** 1 No. internally illuminated fascia sign on front elevation  
131 North Lane, East Preston, BN16 1HB

Mrs Vos said the Preservation Society had no comment to make about this Application.

No public representations about this Application had been received.

The committee AGREED it had no objections to this proposal, although it NOTED there were no other internally-lit signs in the northern shopping area.

**EP/41/19/HH** Loft conversion to existing flat  
128 Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1NN

Mrs Vos said the Preservation Society would be objecting to this Application as the proposed front dormer was too large.

No public representations had been received about this Application.

The committee AGREED it had no concerns about the proposed rear dormer, but it would object to the front dormer as none of the shops in the parade from 146 Sea Road to 106 Sea Road had a front dormer (just one front Velux window above Shortcuts). Therefore this proposal would be a major change to the existing streetscene, contrary to Policy 1, section 4.18 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan which stated, "Preservation of the street scene is important to protect the character of the village."

#### **364/19** WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL (WSCC) PLANNING APPLICATIONS

There were no Planning Applications to consider.

#### **365/19** LICENSING APPLICATIONS

There were no Licensing Applications to consider.

**366/19    ADC – LOCAL VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS LIST**

No comments had been received from the Chairman of the Preservation Society and the committee AGREED it had no comments to make.

**367/19    MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2019**

The committee AGREED the Minutes could be signed as a true record of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> April. This action was duly completed by Cllr Mathias.

**368/19    MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The Clerk reported the Chairman of the Preservation Society had written to the ADC Group Head of Planning, Neil Crowther, as follows:

Dear Mr Crowther

I note that planning permission has been refused for alterations to 2 Hillview Crescent under EP/16/19.

I have been told that the owner of 2 Hillview Crescent has told neighbours that he would build a dormer on the south side of his house, using permitted development rights, if he was refused permission for the alterations covered by EP/16/19. Such a dormer would be extremely damaging to the street scene in Orchard Road. The Officers' Report comments on the uniform character of this road. If the owner does have rights of permitted development to construct such a dormer, I wonder if Arun would consider making an order that requires the householder to obtain planning permission for a dormer?

The decision to refuse EP16/19 has protected the character of Orchard Road for the moment. I hope Arun can block further attacks.

David Sawers  
East Preston and Kingston Preservation Society

Mrs Vos did not believe Mr Sawers had yet received a response.

**369/19    RECENT DECISIONS**

\* denotes Application against which the council raised objections

**EP/183/18/HH**      Two storey side extension...  
11 Michel Grove, East Preston  
Refused (Delegated)

The reasons given for refusal were as follows:

“The proposed development by virtue of its siting, design and scale will have an incongruous impact upon the character and appearance of the area in conflict with policy D DM1 and D DM4(a) of the Arun Local Plan and Policy 2 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan.

“The location and close proximity of the proposed Juliet balcony will lead to an unacceptable level of overlooking of the garden of No.9 Michel Grove in conflict with policy D DM1(3) and D DM4(c) of the Arun Local Plan.”

**EP/4/19/PL**      Conversion of office building...  
56 St Marys Drive, East Preston  
Approved subject to Conditions (Delegated)

**EP/16/19/HH \***      Single storey rear extension with an addition of a second floor...  
2 Hillview Crescent, East Preston  
Refused (Delegated)

The reasons given for refusal were as follows:

“The proposed development, by virtue of its unsympathetic design, significant size and

prominent location is considered to have an unacceptable discordant and incongruous impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as that of the immediate locality contrary to policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan.

“The proposed rear dormer by virtue of its siting and proximity to the boundary will result in and unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties to the north, in conflict with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan.”

**EP/18/19/HH** Single storey rear extension  
21 Warren Crescent, East Preston

Approved subject to Conditions (Delegated)

### **370/19 COMPLIANCE MATTERS**

**ENF/153/18** Alleged unauthorised breach of condition  
131a Sea Road, East Preston, BN16 1PD

“I refer to our previous correspondence and can now advise you that I have received a planning application for – Change of use of boat store & sail loft (Sui Generis) to a single residential dwelling (C3 – Dwellinghouse) & part change of use of the former dinghy pen to caravan site (Sui Generis). The new planning application reference is EP/180/18/PL.” (letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> December 2018)

The Clerk reported a new agreed extension of time on EP/180/18/PL gave ADC a new decision date of 12<sup>th</sup> April. This is because the address on the Application seemed not to have been as the Land Registry would like and so a new set of yellow notices needed to be displayed. (email on ADC website dated 20<sup>th</sup> February 2019)

The latest correspondence on the ADC website about this Application was a letter from the Environment Agency asking ADC to refuse Planning Permission for this Application “in the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).” (letter on ADC website dated 9<sup>th</sup> April 2019)

### **371/19 PLANNING INSPECTORATE APPEALS**

None

### **372/19 EAST PRESTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (EPNP)**

Nothing to report.

### **373/19 AREAS OF SPECIAL CHARACTER**

Nothing to report.

### **374/19 CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence to consider.

### **375/19 NEW MATTERS FOR THE NEXT MEETING (7<sup>TH</sup> MAY)**

The Clerk advised there were no Applications to be considered at the meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> May, and therefore the next meeting would take place on 20<sup>th</sup> May.

*The Meeting closed at 10:07.*

Chairman: *Clr Glyn Mathias* Date: **20<sup>th</sup> May 2019**