

Mr R P Hart
8 Queens Lane
Arundel
West Sussex
BN189JN

Your Ref: OWPC15477
Our Ref: AB/77/17/PL 31-05-2017
Please ask for:
Mr D Easton

5th September 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Demolition of existing dwelling & buildings. Erection of a block of 45 sheltered apartments for the elderly (comprising 21 x one bedroom apartments and 24 x two bedroom apartments age restricted to 60 years and over); with associated access, electric buggy/cycle store, refuse bin store & 34 parking spaces. This application affects the setting of a Listed Building & the character & appearance of the Arundel Conservation Area.

Blastreat Limited and Adjoining Greenhurst Fitzalan Road Arundel

Thank you for your internet representation made on 4th September 2017 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

References:

- A. Renaissance Retirement, Arundel update Letter, Aug 17.*
- B. Indicative Context Elevations - 1650 08 Rev A, 4 Aug 17.*
- C. Transport Statement (May 2017) Rev 2.*

Whilst I support sympathetic development of the Blastreat site in line with the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan, I oppose the Renaissance proposal on the following grounds:

1. Neighbourhood Plan. Ref A contests 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 45-apartment behemoth. A more sympathetic solution must be found.

2. Height of Development. The proposed design would be in an area dominated by low-height one and two-story buildings. Ref B chooses to draw favourable comparison to the height of Martlets Court ('...reflects the height of developments nearby...') 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, not least as the third floor flats have mezzanines and the block will be set higher than current properties (3.9m AOD) to account for flood risk.

3. Insufficient Parking. The development accommodates 34 parking spaces which will be insufficient for the 66(+) 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

in Ref C 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 Ref C are unrealistic; argued from a perspective of 'sheltered accommodation' but for the occupants of 'luxury flats'. The demand for parking from 45 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 45 flats will only increase traffic flow. Both corners linking Queens Street to the development are blind, there are insufficient pavements and, after the public right of way through Caen Stone Court was revoked, parked cars and delivery lorries force pedestrians into the road at both the French Antiques shop and the Fitzalan Road/Queens Street junction. Ref C argues a likely reduction in goods vehicles, however with the rise of internet delivery and associated services for 45 flats the inverse is more likely to be true. The proposed development does not incorporate additional pavements; will increase residential and commercial traffic flow with a concomitant increase in risk to pedestrian safety.

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and will publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning