

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 06 September 2017 08:39
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Blastreat and Greenhurst AB/77/17/PL
Attachments: Planning objection to Blastreat and Greenhurst.docx

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 September 2017 12:57
To: David Easton; Planning.Responses
Subject: Blastreat and Greenhurst AB/77/17/PL

Dear Mr Easton,

Please find attached a letter outlining my objection to the planning proposal AB/77/17/PL for Blastreat and Greenhurst in Arundel.

I request that my personal details be kept confidential.

Thank you very much,

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



5th September 2017

Dear Mr Easton,

Re: Planning Application AB/77/17/PL Blastreat and Greenhurst

I would like to submit my **OBJECTION** to the above planning proposal for the following reasons:

REF Section 9 of the planning application:

I believe that this proposal, which includes demolition of the old Swallow Brewery buildings, fails to recognize the importance of Arundel's historic character.

The Victorian brick buildings on the Blastreat site have a distinct and valued local character; they are eminently worthy of retention rather than demolition. They are a good example of traditional buildings and though not listed, they have important historic associations.

It is unclear to me how the town would benefit from the demolition of these buildings? I believe it would be short sighted to allow their loss now, when an alternative, more sympathetic development could retain them, to the greater benefit of the town's historic character.

The developers have suggested, in their Heritage Statement (May 2017), that as the building is not listed it has no substantial merit. They have indicated that they feel their monolithic, office-style proposal would be a more satisfactory replacement.

I cannot concur with this suggestion. It seems a fundamental misunderstanding of the importance of the historic character of the town.

The overall appearance of the planned development, as detailed, is unsuited to the location and will be highly detrimental to the character of the area.

The proposed development is planned at a height that makes it directly visible from as far out as the Crossbush area of the A27. To use a height comparison with the Martlets development is a poor premise – the difficulties that followed that development certainly indicate that we would be mistaken to allow it to guide policy now. The height of the planned development is such that it will block out views of the upper, historic town.

Whilst not located within the conservation area, it is sufficiently close that it will negatively impact the townscape of Arundel, and directly impact the conservation area.

It is poorly suited to the residential nature of Fitzalan Rd, which is predominantly constituted of single-storey and two-storey buildings.

REF Section 12 of the planning application:

The property is located on a Category 3A Floodplain.

Data provided by the Environment Agency indicates that the site is situated:

- less than 50 m from the River Arun,
- less than 100 m east of a principal aquifer; and
- less than 100 m from the flood plain marshes which lie to the South.

This is a low lying site, which is vulnerable to flood risk.

The Greenhurst site includes a large garden which currently acts as a soakaway in times of high rainfall. See previously submitted photographs at AB/167/15/PL et al.





Image 1 – View from 14A Queens Lane of flooding in Greenhurst, Fitzalan Road.

The application states that the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere. This is evidently not true.

If this soakaway potential is removed by increasing the amount of paving and hardstanding on the proposed development site there will be an increased flood risk to the properties adjacent, opposite and behind the proposed development.

We need to boost our flood protection capability in Arundel – not push it to its limit. We have recently seen the impact of the breach in the flood wall at Arun Street. If this development is permitted to remove part of the localities' natural defences against flooding then it will directly increase the flood risk to properties in this part of Arundel, including Queens Lane and Fitzalan Rd.

REF Section 13 of the planning application:

The application states that there is no reasonable likelihood of protected and priority species being affected on or on land adjacent to the development. This fails to take account of the existing bat populations both at and adjacent to the location of the proposed development.

REF Section 14 of the planning application:

Due to the nature of the Blastreat works, the land on the proposed development site can be reasonably expected to be contaminated. Therefore a contamination assessment should be submitted.

IMPACT ON OTHER PROPERTIES:

The proposed development, which is planned to have apartments on four levels/storeys, is situated immediately south of my own property, at a distance of a single road width.

If permitted it would therefore result in substantial loss of light to my home, including principal bedroom and kitchen. Furthermore, as we have a small end of terrace property, the proposed development is of such a height that it would also overshadow the garden to the rear of our property.

The large and expansive windows in the proposed development would look directly down and into my property – including the bedroom. From the developers plans there would be multiple properties that would be close enough to have a direct view into my home, resulting in a substantial loss of privacy.

Whereas we currently have a pleasant residential outlook, with gardens to the South, this development would replace that with an extremely dominant and overbearing building. It would create a dark and oppressive environment.

The proposed development:

- does not follow Arun policy regarding affordable housing
- does not follow the Neighbourhood Plan (part of the Strategic Development Plan
- proposes more luxury retirement apartments for an area which is already swamped with this type of development
- has insufficient parking to meet the needs of residents
- fails to protect the historic character of the area; and
- is likely to increase the flood risk to the surrounding area.

Please accept this as confirmation of my OBJECTION to the proposal.

Thank you for your consideration,

Yours sincerely

