

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 10 September 2018 09:30
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection to Planning Application B/36/18/PL: Renaissance Retirement Proposal for Blastreat Site, Fitzalan Road, Arundel

Please treat as a rep for AB/36/18/PL

Anita Gardner | Principal Planner, Directorate of Place, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 September 2018 21:48
To: Anita Gardner
Subject: Objection to Planning Application B/36/18/PL: Renaissance Retirement Proposal for Blastreat Site, Fitzalan Road, Arundel

Dear Mrs Gardner,

please find attached letter of objection **against** planning application B/36/18/PL , the Renaissance development at Blastreet/Greenhurst, Arundel.

Yours faithfully,

Richard Hart

8 Queens Lane, Arundel, BN19 9JN.

Mr R P Hart
8 Queens Lane
Arundel
West Sussex
BN18 9JN

Planning Applications,
Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
BN17 5LF

9th September 2018

Objection to Planning Application B/36/18/PL: Renaissance Retirement Proposal for Blastreat Site, Fitzalan Road, Arundel

References:

A. Letter of Objection, 'Objection to Planning Application AB/77/17/PL', dated 18 Aug 2017.

I write to object to the resubmitted plans for the development of the Blastreat site by Renaissance Retirement and their proposal for 46 retirement flats; the objections in my letter of 18 Aug 2017 (Ref A) remain extant. Furthermore:

1. **Neighbourhood Plan.** The developer has contested the Neighbourhood Plan on grounds that it ignores recent government direction to reflect demographic change. Whilst government targets may have changed, this need not affect the plan for the Blastreat/Greenhurst site, nor should we now disregard a plan carefully compiled from an evidence base of over 40 reports/documents, and migrate plans for 24 family houses into a 46-apartment behemoth. The Neighbourhood Plan sensibly proposes *affordable family housing* for the site, not another retirement block for the elderly when current supply already outstrips demand. Options for the developer *to pay to offset* the requirement for affordable housing must be rejected outright.
2. **Height of Development.** The proposed design would be in an area dominated by low-height one and two-story buildings. The plans choose to draw favourable comparison to the height of Martlets Court and Wesbury Lodge, but conveniently ignores the overbearing effect it will have on surrounding houses, the height of the buildings it will replace, blocking of sunlight and adverse impact on views into and out of the conservation area. The excessive height of Martlet's Court remains a point of contention; we should not compound the error by citing this as an acceptable benchmark for future developments. The height reductions made since the original Renaissance plans have not since made this an acceptable proposal.
3. **Insufficient Parking.** The development accommodates 34 parking spaces which will be insufficient for the 70 occupants; the overspill from which will compound the already congested parking on Fitzalan Road or elsewhere in town. Given that the future retirement age is increasing we should assume that a large number of occupants will continue to work for a number of years and will require parking on a level that exceeds the ratios used for a mix of 'sheltered housing' and 'private flats'. The flats are '*designed to accommodate residents who live a largely independent lifestyle*', more likely therefore to sustain the use of a car(s), the Advanced Institute of Motoring estimating that over the next 20 years the number of male drivers over 70 will *double*, and female drivers will *treble*. The selective metrics used in the parking estimates are unrealistic; argued from a perspective of 'sheltered accommodation' but for the occupants of 'luxury flats'. The demand for parking from 46 such flats will exceed provision; Arundel can ill-afford to add to the lack of parking by sanctioning a developer's desire to maximise profit.
4. **Pedestrian Safety.** Access to the development from Queens Street is already a safety concern for pedestrians, specifically those accessing the town / station from Queens Lane; the

addition of 46 flats will only increase traffic flow. Both corners linking Queens Street to the development are blind, there are insufficient pavements and parked cars and delivery lorries force pedestrians into the road at both the French Antiques shop and the Fitzalan Road/Queens Street junction. The developer argues a likely *reduction* in goods vehicles, however with the rise of internet delivery and associated services for 46 flats the inverse is more likely to be true. This section of road is dangerous now; a development of this size will only increase the risk to pedestrian safety.

Flood risk. Finally I have particular concerns over the increased risk of flooding to properties on Fitzalan and Queens Road. I note from the developer's plans that the development will be elevated to mitigate flood risk, but the run-off from surface water will drain towards Queens lane. I would also note that the water table is already high in this area of town, we often have standing water in both the water meadows, on the Greenhurst plot and in Queens Lane (maintained by the Angmering Estate) as the drains are already sub-optimal. The development will increase the run-off, which I see is planned to drain *towards* Queens Lane through the soak-aways. Extant properties should not be put at risk of increased flooding or standing water due to the additional demand placed on the drainage system by such a large development.

Yours,

R P Hart