Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0937/18

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 14 July 2018 at 15:33
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:33 PM on 14 Jul 2018 from Mr Barry Candy.

Application Summary

Address: The Glebe Primary School Church Lane Southwick Brighton West Sussex BN42 4GB

Proposal: Consultation by WSCC on Reg 3 application WSCC/030/18/SW for installation of new lighting layout to existing car parking area.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Barry Candy

Email: [redacted]

Address: 40 Oldfield Crescent, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex BN42 4FZ

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other

Comments: I object to certain aspects of the application.
The use of high (4metre) steel galvanised street lighting columns within the school site car park is out of character with the semi-rural ambience of the area. The reduction from 5metres to 4metre height columns in the proposal will not make any noticeable improvement since they will still be significantly higher than garden walls and fences.
The local planning authority for many years has sympathetically protected adjacent and nearby features such as the historic embankment in Church Lane (where the school's access joins it), extensive historic flint walling flanking the school's car park and accessway, the nearby Norman church and the designated Conservation Area. However, this application proposes to upset this carefully nurtured balance. High steel industrial type lighting columns are out of scale with the area and are an unsympathetic choice of design. Adequate lighting can be achieved using bollard type lighting which have appropriate scale and are sympathetic with the impact on the neighbouring amenity. Bollard type lighting is used successfully at other small school car park sites locally, including at schools which have recently been redeveloped / expanded. Bollard lights are already proposed for the majority of the site

within this application (9 bollards and 3 tall columns) and so substituting the 3 columns for bollards would give continuity of both design and scale for the site.
The 4 metre high industrial columns are a disturbance of the neighbouring amenity since they negatively impact on the background outlook of our garden during the daytime by intruding into the tree-line, and glare of the lighting intrudes into our windows at night. This is a real nuisance for neighbouring residents and it must be noted that the columns are already in place so we can therefore comment with clarity on the "proposal". Our garden and house levels are lower than the school site making the 4 metre high columns more intrusive than the plans suggest. Shielding will not significantly help as it will make the lanterns more visible during the day and the high columns produce a very intense light source which refracts through the damp evening air causing a radiance of light in the atmosphere which shielding won't mask . Bollard type lighting in lieu of the high columns, however, would not produce these negative effects on the amenity or upset the character of the area.
WSCC's lighting contractor confirmed at a residents' meeting that column lighting can be substituted for bollards by using addition numbers of them. He said he was reluctant to change to bollards because of the increased risk of potential vandalism, however, the layout design was then subsequently extended to include the accessway, this time just using bollard lighting. WSCC have therefore demonstrated that vandalism is clearly not an issue for them. Indeed, other local schools have bollard lighting in their car parks without experiencing any problems with them.
The carpark site is immediately adjacent to a Conservation Area with part of the lighting in the accessway falling within the Conservation Area. The technical details shown in the supporting documents confirm wide spread intense lighting levels around the high columns with lower spread levels around the bollards. The technical details also fail to take into account new flood lighting installed on the school buildings which adds significantly to glare and lux levels on the site. This has been demonstrated when car park lighting has been turned off but flood lighting on the buildings has remained on. The whole car park site was still illuminated albeit to a lower intensity.
For clarity, I do not object to lighting of the car park, but do strongly object to how it is proposed to be achieved. High steel galvanised industrial columns are completely out of character with the environment, cause a nuisance to the school's neighbours, and they adversely affect the amenity we enjoy.
I request an amendment to the proposal which substitutes the high columns for bollard lights to give continuity of design and scale.