From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 22 September 2023 21:29
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1116/23

Flag Status: Flagged

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 22/09/2023 9:28 PM from Mr Tim Quick.

Application Summary

Address:	Residents Parking Adjacent 91 Prince Charles Close Southwick West Sussex
Proposal:	Redevelopment of existing car park and ball court to provide 5no. dwellings with associated works including access, parking and landscaping
Case Officer:	Gary Peck

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Tim Quick
Address:	83 Prince Charles Close, Southwick, West Sussex BN42 4PQ

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Conflict with planning policies: The council has long neglected areas of open space and recreation all around the district, including the areas within the Close subject to this development, to the point that the surface of the ball court would deemed unsafe to use for many children and with one entrance currently blocked off entirely by overgrowth. The Planning Statement falsely claims that this ball court is 'disused'. However, despite the council's own neglect, which given this application and claim could be viewed as intentional, this recreational space is used as evidenced by the hoop net which I personally witnessed being put up earlier this year by a local resident for their child. It has also been witnessed being in use on many other occasions.

Removal of open space and recreation area would in my opinion appear contrary to the Adur Local Plan 2017 (policy 32); which suggests that this development should not be permitted as there is no alternative, it is not surplus to requirements, and no replacement is being provided of equivalent or improved quantity and quality.

It is predicted that the council may likely seek to leverage their own neglect of Mile Oak Road Park, last 'revamped in 2006' and subsequently left to fall into serious disrepair. I do hope to be wrong, and that council meet their statutory duty to maintain this park as well as the spaces within the Close, regardless of the outcome of this planning application, as their interests should not conflict with the health and safety of local children.

Highway safety, traffic and parking:

IMO, the council has provided a misleading parking survey which does not provide a reliable basis for decision-making and does not adequately assess the harm to highway safety from the development. The parking survey's apparent manipulation of their data inflates the supposed parking capacity of the Close, far exceeding reality. The report states that where there is no kerbside restriction present this will be classified as "Unrestricted" and as a result almost all areas of the Close would seem to be considered 'unrestricted' parking. If this were the case then to meet full parking capacity, drivers are seemingly recommended to carry out numerous traffic offences in breach of Highway Code Rule 243, to park such that they:
1. 'Prevent access for Emergency Services', as well as any other road users, by parking on both sides of a road too narrow to accommodate it i.e., not 9m width (as per the WSCC's Parking Policy).
2. 'Opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction', where traffic can approach from three different directions.
3. 'Where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles', as these have not been identified as drop kerbs.
4. 'In front of an entrance to a property', such as the entrance of the St Louie allotment.
5. 'On a bend', which there are several owing to the Close being oval.

The capacity then appears to be further inflated by taking the lengths of supposed unrestricted parking and 'dividing it by 5m (Standard car length)', despite current Best Practice standards using 6m for parallel parking on a highway to account for increased car sizes and some allowance for manoeuvrability.

To highlight how difficult it is to park safely on the highway within Prince Charles Close. There are two disabled parallel parking bays on the highways one to the North of Birch Court on the junction (bay width of 2.4m). The other is on the bend adjacent to House #55 (bay width of only 1.72m) the road at this point has an overall width of 5.5m. The minimum width of such disabled bay should be 2.7m. These bays have been drastically reduced in size because the overall width of the carriageway is insufficient to accommodate them as is the case throughout Hillside. The safety of road users and pedestrians in being impacted by such actions.

The surveys purported headline figure of total 198 spaces within the Close. However, applying WSCC's Guidance on Parking at New Developments (2020) to calculate the required parking provision for the existing housing located within Parking Behaviour Zone 2 (Hillside) suggests that these spaces would only just meet the parking provision requirements of existing residents were it a new development and there were truly that many spaces. This is not accounting for the additional parking that should also be provided for visitors, out of area amenity users (Brighton & Hove's allotment) and overspill from surrounding roads. It is therefore absurd to suggest that the proposal is 'providing' any parking provision for this new development when it results in significantly reduced parking whilst further increasing demand. Taking from one to give to another adds nothing, and considering this is one of two such proposal within this Close, it would have serious impact.

It is also odd that whilst the plans seek to ensure that this supposed new parking provision is 'sited in small groups, close and adjacent to homes' for the new development, whilst existing resident's vehicles can be 'displaced' to the local highway network encompassing a large area over two counties and four different wards which themselves benefit from stricter parking enforcement.

The usage is then seemingly undercalculated by exclusion of illegally parked vehicles. Numerous vehicles are continuously parked over the verge and footways both along Mile Oak Road and around the Close itself, it would appear for this reason these have not been included in the count. These traffic offences are a direct result of inadequate road markings, parking restrictions and enforcement, risking the safety of both road users and pedestrians alike. The presence of these uncounted vehicles unarguably would prevent any other vehicles parking kerbside at those locations and that they have opted to park in those locations only serves as evidence that other more suitable and safer options are limited. As such, their exclusion conveniently provides an inaccurate representation of usage and space.

The proposed position of one new parking bay would replace a once green grass verge that is already regularly used for parking (not included in the survey as in breach of highway code 244). Parking here seriously affects visibility and thus safety as there is no room to see oncoming traffic when driving around the bend. In fact, every bend on the close has limited visibility and is generally down to a single lane due to parked vehicles on one side of the road.

Considering there are multiple housing projects from large estates to single dwellings throughout East and West Sussex. There appears to be very little or no amenities and services for an already struggling Water, Electric, Gas, Schools, Doctors, Dentists, Road capacity. So, proposing two major projects considering the size of the Close will cause massive disruptions to everyday living; expecting residents including the elderly and those with young families to park in other roads, even in another county where residence parking permits may soon be required, especially the way this parking requirement is spreading in Brighton and Hove to ensure its residents have access to parking near their homes is preposterous.

Kind regards