Nicola Spencer

From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 September 2014 09:31
To: Planning; Nicola Spencer
Cc: Janice Chapman
Subject: Emailing: OBJECTION TO : AW-201-14- HH 53 Kingsway - extensions to front and rear 20-8-2014

Importance: High

Dear Sir

The WRONG reference was used last evening and this objection is to **AW/201/14/HH. CAN YOU PLEASE BE SO GOOD AS TO DELETE ALL REFERENCES TO AW/184/14/HH.**

INDEED, THE ORIGINAL EMAIL OF 11.17 PM ON THE 31ST MAY BE DELETED AND THIS SUBSTITUTED.

With sincere apologies; thanks and regards,

Richard Ostler, Chairman, CHECAA.

[redacted]

CHECAA

Craigweil House and its Environs Conservation Area Association

'Preserving our Regal, Historic and Architectural Heritage for Future Generations'

AW-201-14-HH – 53 Kingsway –extensions to front and rear 20-8-2014

Head of Planning Services
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

BY EMAIL ONLY

20 August 2014

Dear Sir

OBJECTION – AW/201/14/HH – 53 Kingsway – front and rear extensions

CHECAA comprises in excess of 200 members, each committed to ensuring that the spirit and intent of conservation as set out in Section 69 of the Act; in Policy Area 2 of the Arun District Local Plan and elsewhere are respected and complied with in every application submitted for development at Craigweil House Conservation Area (CA). Similarly, they seek to ensure that the criteria of the Area of Special Character (ASC) in Planning Policy Area 1 are addressed. Much more in the Local Plan applies, in our view.

The applicant site, 53 Kingsway is located within this uniquely, dual-designated, area.

CHECAA's Planning Applications Scrutiny Committee has studied this application in detail and is not persuaded that the proposals serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, nor that they will make a positive contribution to the ASC. Indeed, CHECAA contends that much of the proposed development will be detrimental to the CA and ASC. We object to this application, inter alia, upon the grounds that:-

1. The CA has evolved, in phases, through more than 80 years, with development ceased during and after World War 2 for reasons obvious. We know nothing of the materials proposed to be used except for a generic statement in the Design and Access Statement that they *will' match the existing house'*. The house is set in spacious grounds in accord with the design concept of the developer, Sir Arthur Du Cros and his eminent architect, Joshua Auty, FRIBA, and **is as described in the CA Statement established *'with spacing between properties at ground and first floor level providing a sense of spaciousness.'***

2. Allowing the proposed eastern, stepped back garage to be brought forward to be flush with the front of the existing property would create a flat and lifeless façade of no architectural merit whatever and to allow a second floor to be built above it, similarly, would destroy all that original design creating that sense of spaciousness, and CHECAA considers this to be a destructive element both of the appearance and character of the area and to be damaging to the street scene. More than this, in conflict with ASC criteria, we say that this element makes no positive contribution.

3. Knocking on from that is that, contrary to the Article 4 Direction requirements, no application is made to alter the hard surfacing and that the removal of the garage will, in turn, ensure that the frontage is used for parking and that no garage will exist as is required by the Arun District Local Plan, 2003.

4. Policy DEV19 requires at (i) that *'the extension sympathetically relates to and is visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, design, for, scale and materials. CHECAA says that these proposals fail those tests.*

5. Part (ii) of DEV19 requires that the extension*' is visually subservient to the main building'*. CHECAA contends that the front, eastern section is grossly dominating of the existing building.

6. Part (iii) of DEV19 states that *'the extension does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties.'* CHECAA says that these proposals conflict heavily with this section, particularly with multiple dormer windows enjoying a virtual panoramic view of all areas but Wychwood Close to the north with 4 dormers overlooking.

7. The reason for DEV19 is stated as being *'The District Council is keen to ensure that extensions to existing properties do not have an adverse effect on the street scene, amenities of adjoining properties (including privacy!) or the character of an area'*.

8. Section (v) of DEV19 says *'the extension does not compromise the established special character and pattern of the street'*. CHECAA must, therefore, go on to look at the western front porch, which is an attractive feature of the building era, and finds that this is also to be destroyed if this development is allowed. **And we then have a completely flat fronted, characterless house created from the destruction of that which exists and we find this totally unacceptable.**

9. **A THIRD floor has been created and this will represent an undesirable precedent in Kingsway where, even with bungalows – but to create a consistent street scene – the architect Auty required that a dummy first floor be built. That was carefully thought out but a third floor is unacceptable and, we suggest, unnecessary, if just three people are to live there.**

10. If, on the other hand, the elderly mentally disabled brother of this couple is to be cared for then should there not be a change of use application?

11. **CHECAA is surprised that there are no floor plans submitted or requested and asks that these be supplied for the general view is that a house of multiple occupation is being created – and neither we nor the LPA has any way of knowing. Even vaguely, what is to be the ultimate use of this property?**

12. In the 'summary' to the D&A Statement, the applicant says ***'The proposal is for an extension to the existing dwelling to provide suitable family accommodation with a separate annex'.*** We see no such 'annex' indicated and wonder why not!

13. The last sentence of the D&A Statement says ***'...this proposal will present little significant detrimental impact to the area...'*** **and this is a clear acceptance that harm WILL be cause to the Craigweil House Conservation Area and Area of Special Character.**

14. CHECAA find it quite remarkable that the applicant's only mention of the site being located within a designated area is in the D&A Statement under 'Amount' and which says ***The site is located within the built up area of the Craigwell (sic) Estate and in a Conservation area.'*** The 'disrepair' mentioned is of the applicant's own making and not the responsibility of any third part!

15. The applicant does not even hint at any way in which this development will, as is required, serve to ***'preserve or enhance the character or appearance or setting'*** of the Craigweil House Conservation Area or of how it will serve to make a ***'positive contribution'*** to the Craigweil House Area of Special Character. There are many other aspects of this application which are in conflict with Policy GEN7 and other policies and legislation which we consider it unnecessary to enumerate.

CHECAA asks that this application, please, be refused.

Yours faithfully

Richard D. Ostler
Chairman