

Nicola Spencer | Technical Support Manager, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37446 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37446 | E-mail: nicola.spencer@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From:
Peter
Dean

Sent: 18 August 2017 13:55

To: Planning

Subject: Application AB/77/17/PL

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

10, Old Poorhouse Cottages,
Mount Pleasant,
Arundel, BN18 9BD

Application Ref : AB/77/17/PL – Blastreat Site, Fitzalan Road
Objection to Proposed Development

Dear Sirs,

I wish to lodge my formal objection to the above proposed development by Renaissance Retirement Ltd. The main reasons are admirably set down in detail in the statement by the Arundel Town Council (16th December 2016) presented by the mayor.

In addition, I suggest the following points are germane to the careful assessment of the case made to justify the building of the 45 apartments:

1. Purpose – In the documents the development is variously described as sheltered housing, retirement flats and luxury apartments. Reference to the company website establishes the latter to be the correct objective.

Statements in the documents indicate that the minimum age for purchasers will be 55, therefore, the age range of married residents could be from 50 upwards. Taking account of the raised pension age, a number living there are likely to be employed (probably not in Arundel).

2. Affordable Housing Provision – The presented documents make clear that, for the proposed scale of development, 14 units should be sold at a discounted price to satisfy the current regulations on this matter. The number and nature of the luxury apartments result in estimated development costs leaving insufficient profit for the developer. The proposed sale prices are based on local statistics and result in one unit being valued at £792,000.

Local opinion rejects the need for more retirement flats but accepts the need for affordable family accommodation in Arundel.

3. Pedestrians – No provision for a sidewalk is made along the building frontage unlike the adjacent Westbury Lodge.

The sidewalk on the northern side of Fitzalan Road leading to the alleyway to Queen Street is both inadequate in width and undefined for part of its length.

Egress from the buggy store is onto a carriageway of Fitzalan Road. The buggy crossing is situated mid-way between two blind ninety degree bends and the other side of the road (leading to the alleyway) has no sidewalk and is frequently blocked by delivery lorries. This would require buggies to move into the middle of the road to pass.

4. Vehicles – No provision is made in the building frontage for parking of delivery vehicles. Access to the parking area is not inviting for larger vehicles and no turning area has been shown in the car park

so it is probable that normal delivery practice of parking in the road whilst delivering will be followed.

In spite of Renaissance confirming the development was luxury apartments the parking calculation was based on it being sheltered housing. By providing more than the calculated minimum for this category it is argued the proposed provision is acceptable. Owners of expensive properties are likely to have vehicles and will not be discouraged by a parking fee of 70p per day. Furthermore, some owners will probably be working so have more than one car.

It is proposed one bay will be provided for a concierge but no allowance is made for visiting workers, e.g. cleaners.

Egress from the car park is close to a blind ninety degree bend in the road and in the opposite direction visibility may be obstructed by an illegally parked delivery vehicle.

5. Building – The size, height and positioning of the building is unsympathetic and imposing on the immediate environment. Clearly this is because the design has been based on the objective to maximise profit but the height is also dictated by the need to accommodate estimated flood risk to the ground floor. Surely a less expensive development would be financially viable and appropriate for the site.

I have focused my criticisms on vehicle and pedestrian safety for I am a retired professional city highways engineer, which explains my unease about these elements of the proposals.

Yours faithfully,

P. J. Dean Pr. Eng. BSc (Civil)