

D R A F T

Saffron Lodge, 46 Kingsway
Bognor Regis, West Sussex, PO21 4DN

My Ref: AW/312/14/HH-1

5th January 2015

Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road
Littlehampton, West Sussex
BN17 5LF
FAO Head of Planning Services

Dear Sirs

Ref: OBJECTION to Planning Application AW/312/14/HH- 37 Kingsway, Craigweil

1. I have browsed the documents regarding this application. I now have reason to be critical of the proposals. In criticizing, I am mindful that plans submitted to the Council should be clear and accurate, showing respect and knowledge of the Council's Policies. Answering Council's questions must be true and accurate, not misleading or open to misinterpretation or misrepresentation. I am puzzled too at the inclusion in the webpage details of an unrelated letter entered on 2 Dec 14 from a Mr Dennis Weymouth, who does not appear to have any connection with this Application.
2. Firstly, I am very unhappy with the way in which the applicant has approached the matter of the Craigweil House Conservation Area (CHCA). There is no Design and Access Statement contained within this Application. Indeed there is no mention at all within the Application papers that the CHCA exists. I must therefore conclude that the Applicant and his/her Agent has not read nor has the intention of considering the requirements of Conservation Areas within Arun District Council and more specially the CA Statement relating to the CHCA within the District Local Plan and it's Emerging, replacement Local Plan for 2011-2031. Only the District Council's overstamp on the Application mentions the CA, stating the plans 'affects the character and appearance of the CHCA', so thank you ADC for correcting the Applicants ignorance. From the emails attached to the Application, It would appear that the Applicant's Agent also neglected to include the proposed new carport in his submission, so again thank you ADC for assisting to bring accurate information to bear.
3. So I repeat the words from my previous submission on AW/132/14/HH—
 - a. *{ Firstly, the Application contains no Design and Access Statement that I understand Arun DC requires of its Applicants to render changes within its Conservation Areas. No appreciation of the District's guidelines is therefore accounted for by the Applicant or his Agent. It is not surprising therefore, that the cramped and overcrowded design, within an area noted for its open, spacious character, is seen as incongruous to the concept of the CA descriptions, where the open, spacious character of the CHCA is lauded by all involved, not least in the District's own **CA Statement for the CHCA**, which says in relation to density of Kingsway, under:-*

- b. *General Description (Page 4): "This is reflected in the slightly higher density of Wychwood Close leading to the lower densities of The Drive, Kingsway and Queensway".*
 - c. *Then at "Kingsway (Page 6)-- " Houses are set back from the verges throughout Kingsway with spacing between properties both at ground and first floor levels providing a sense of spaciousness". }*
4. This lack of acknowledgment or awareness on the Applicant's part of ADC's Policy Statements reflects this Application's detail where the proposals, whilst changed from the previous AW/132/14/HH, still ignore the impact the proposed development has on the character, appearance and spaciousness of the CHCA, lauded by all who endorsed the creation of the CHCA in April 2009.
5. The proposal also continues to have an overpowering impact on immediate neighbours, especially to the east at No 39 Kingsway. Infilling the eastern side of the dwelling, right up to and in my judgement overhanging, the neighbour's curtilage, is just inconsiderate and unneighbourly. Maintenance of the proposed new conservatory on the east side of the property will require access from the neighbour's land.
6. So again from my previous submission:-
 - a. *{The proposed infilling of the **east side of the property** flowing to the full depth of the existing house and beyond, hard up against the boundary is **certainly not enhancing the requirement for 'spaciousness'**.}*
7. I submit therefore that the provision of **ADC Policy DEV 19** (iii) is specifically offended by these proposals. As indeed are the other sub-clauses of that policy. The proposed works are not sympathetic to the existing building in design or form as at (i), I say the new western entrance is not subservient to the main building (ii), the proposed plans fill the visual gap between Nos. 37 & 39 Kingsway as seen in the street scene (iv) and at (v) the proposals contribute to 'enclosing' the special character of the street scene of the principal roadway of the CHCA in Kingsway.
8. I note on drawing ADS-004 dated 4th November 2014 that the existing garage is described as 'Existing Workshop', giving the impression there is no garage on the property at present. I believe this to be misleading and inaccurate and important when considering what is being proposed overall. The placement of the existing garage was surely intended to take that structure well away from the roadway and retain the spacious character of the property as seen from the road. By removing that garage facility and infilling in front of it, together with the now proposed skeletal car port, this character of spaciousness is completely destroyed and flies in the face of the CHCA requirements in the District Plan.
9. Whilst touching on the Car Port, on the Application in answer to Question 8 - 'Will the proposed works affect existing car parking arrangements?' the Applicant ticks the box 'NO'. I submit this is quite wrong. By removing the existing garage, building, a new conservatory in front of it to the south together with the erection of a skeletal car port, the Applicant is changing considerably the PARKING facilities, removing two parking places, bringing standing vehicles into permanent

view and several metres forward from their present position. This too effects the character and appearance of the property, contributing to a detrimental change to the street scene. The answer to Question 8 is therefore **YES** and not No. The answer is misleading and inaccurate.

10. My previous submission said:-

- a. Under **Policy Area 1(iii) Areas of Special Character**, with which Craigweil is also covered, requires Applications to **"make a positive contribution to the special character of these areas..."** I submit that these plans **do not** make such a positive contribution, indeed the opposite is the case due to the cramped nature of the structures proposed.
- b. Similarly, **Policy GEN 22** says that "Planning Permission will not be granted where.. .."development would adversely affect the appearance or setting..." And again **Policy Area 2 Conservation Areas**, requires development to "preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a CA or its setting". These plans **do nothing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance, nor the setting of this property or its neighbours.**

11. Question 12 asks 'Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land?' The Applicant answers YES. With great respect this is only half true. The front elevations can certainly be seen from the street in Kingsway, but the side and rear elevations cannot be so seen. This is another inaccurate answer to a quite specific question.

12. In my opinion, the ridged roof detail of the proposed new entrance 'conservatory' entirely conflicts with the balance of the southern elevation of the building, standing out as a most unattractive 'feature', conflicting with the building's existing, balanced design and is seen therefore as out of character. Whilst a personal view, I believe most professionals would agree.

13. Misleading drawings I believe should be rejected by Arun DC. Drawing ADS-003 shows what is supposed to be the Existing Plans/Elevations. The drawing is inaccurate, indeed misleading as, compared with one of the photographs attached, it will be noted that the design of the upper south elevation omits the characterful detail of the window and roof tile heading above it. Someone not familiar with the building **would naturally assume there is no change in the new detailing on Drawing ADS-005 - Proposed Plans/Elevations**. Similarly the detail on these two drawings of the south ground floor window assumes/suggests no change. Comparison with the attached photographs again reveal a characterful existing, tiled detail of the bay window roof. **BOTH** these examples illustrate what I see as a lack of appreciation and respect for the true 'characteristics' of the building. I suggest there may well be a deliberate attempt to mislead all those viewing the drawings.

14. Next, I consider the volume of the proposed plans over-development, creating unneighbourly and overbearing conditions to the immediate neighbours, especially to the east at No 39 Kingsway. The construction of a lengthy side elevation some 8/9 feet high, hard up to the boundary, **without a passageway between the properties**, whether in brick or fully rendered, **is totally out of sympathy and consideration for ones neighbours**. Maintenance, in addition to construction, will require regular access onto the neighbour's property and if the detail is correct,

rainwater goods will actually be within the neighbour's curtilage, totally unacceptable in my judgement. I also see no provision for soakaways from the eastern boundary rainwater goods.

15. The siting of the new entrance 'conservatory' on the west side of the property is 'squared off' rather than angled as is the existing entrance glazing. This creates a 'blocked' appearance and detracts from the 'spacious' character of the existing structure, even though set back slightly from the previous plan in AW/132/14/HH. The new plan becomes an extremely dominant feature and again detracts from the spacious requirement within the CHCA.
16. Over-building over the existing driveway leading to the existing garage will reduce the availability of parking space for vehicles of occupiers as well as their visitors. The Craigweil Private Estate Ltd, the Company to which all residents belong, discourage roadway parking, so the removal of parking space within curtilage increases the risk of road/street parking. Increasing street parking is certainly not "enhancing" the street scene within a Conservation Area. **This is the CHCA.**
17. Lastly, I listened with interest to Aldwick Parish Council when they heard this Application, where they retained their unanimous opposition to it on similar grounds as previously with AW/132/14/HH.

There is no justification for these excessive proposals and I ask that for the foregoing reasons you **REFUSE** this Application.

Yours faithfully



Attached photographs show:

1. Front/southern elevation, with correct roof detailing, not shown on submitted drawings.
2. Trees and shrubs on the eastern boundary (in No.39's garden).
3. Western entrance, to be 'squared off' and brought forward in the proposed changes.

CC. Aldwick Parish Council

Ward Councillor Mrs G.Brown

Mr Martyn White, Conservation Officer







