

Saffron Lodge
46 Kingsway, PO21 4DN
My Ref: AW/85/18/HH-1

13th May 2018

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

BY EMAIL

Dear Sirs

Ref: **OBJECTION** : AW/85/18/HH (54 Kingsway, Craigweil.)

I have studied this Application and further comments on line and OBJECT to many elements of it **owing to the site's proximity** to the Craigweil House Conservation Area (CHCA) and the Craigweil House Area of Special Character (CHASC).

Whilst not situated within the CHCA nor the CHASC, this house is immediately next/adjacent to them and as this Application states, "This Application **may** affect the character and appearance of the Craigweil House Conservation Area." I strongly say it **DOES** affect the CA.

The issues I have a problem with are on several grounds.

LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES.

1. In Arun DC's District Plans (**both Existing and Evolving**), there are Policies designed to make '**positive contributions**' – (**Policy AREA 1(iii)**). At the 'Explanation' 2.03 it says: It is important that the criteria for designation are selective, otherwise the principle of special protection becomes eroded.' Then to– (**Policy Area 2**) where '**to preserve or enhance**' is the **requirement for Conservation Areas**. As stated above, whilst this application site is not within either an ASC nor a CA, **the fact that it abuts both at Craigweil** must require the LA to consider **views into, out of and from within the site**.
Clearly these plans/proposals fail to Preserve or Enhance the area nor do they in my view show any Positive Contribution to anything.
2. **Policy Dev 19** refers to **special awareness** of surrounding buildings. So close to No 52 Kingsway and infilling the space above the garage, it is unsympathetic and compromises the space between property, contrary to the **general** street scene and pattern of development in the CHCA. The drawings give no indication as to closeness, apart from **maybe a 234 MM (9-10") gap on the western elevation..**
3. **At Policy GEN7, (iv)** it says Development; '**does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers....**' Then at **(v) Development will be permitted provided it takes account of any unacceptable adverse impacts that may arise from adjoining land uses or property.'** Again clearly, **these proposals have a considerable and unacceptable impact in the immediate area**. All surrounding properties will have a very different outlook to that which exists, reducing the relatively open aspect, into a closed and block effect with the large infill over the replaced ground floor garage space.
4. In the emerging District Plan, Para c of HER DM3 says "Alterations or additions to existing buildings are sensitively designed, constructed of appropriate materials and are sympathetic in scale, form and detailing and retain or emphasise the features and qualities

of the existing buildings, townscape or streetscape in the area.” As stated, this building is not in the CHCA or CHASC, BUT it is immediately adjacent to it and therefore must surely reflect this policy requirement. I contend it does not.

5. HER DM3j concerns ‘harming important views into, out of or within the Conservation Area’. Clearly the appearance of the proposed design will be seen from north, east and west directions including maybe Marquis Way, and therefore **it’s block like effect will have, in my opinion, a prominent and adverse effect upon the surrounding area.**
6. **GEN 22** says: ‘Planning permission will not be granted for development..... **Alterations, extensions** or other development which would adversely **affect the appearance or setting** of such buildings or structures **will not be permitted.**’ Then again at 1.72(5) Preferably, although not exclusively, they should ‘**make a positive contribution to their surroundings or the street scene.**’ I contend these criteria are not met by this Application.
7. Removal of the garage from the property also dictates that cars will always be on view in the front garden, a very different situation to property generally, where parking is contained within garages. Craigweil is not a ‘town centre nor are other means of transport close at hand.’ Residents here have cars in the main, in this case at least two. **GEN 12** is designed to ensure parking is appropriate for the area. Although this Application will meet the standards required for the number of bedrooms, 2 cars will need to be parked within the small front garden. Families with children, this family has three, it is most likely there will be more vehicle parking required in the near future. The likelihood of street parking then comes into play, especially with no garage on site. Street parking in Kingsway is discouraged by the Estate Management and residents abide by that norm now. Any erosion of that ‘norm’ will create a precedent.

OTHER MATTERS.

8. Study of the initial Application gave no indication as to the colour of the proposed cladding material, even though **Question 11 specifically requires** details of **type, colour and name of materials** to be recorded. The only colour mentioned is Dark Grey for the roof slates, hopefully not black. The Applicant’s subsequent email at least confirms the colour of the cladding to be Cream/Off White. The query on this was obviously raised due to the Agent/Architect’s omission in Question 11. **Even now, many details from Question 11 are still not recorded.**
9. Looking purely at the design of the house in this Application, I would first say that there is no particular quality in the existing building, it is typical of the 1970’s speculative construction, well prior to the establishment of the CHASC or CHCA. With the designated areas now in place, they deserve something more in respect of the quality and character of the areas, rather than just a run of the mill cladding alterations proposed. Unfortunately, the ‘block’ appearance of all elevations, only detract from the more traditional character of Craigweil property. As above, it is the view of the building from within the CA & ASC that is paramount.
10. The work to No.53 Kingsway, opposite this site, recently redeveloped, presents a much better design profile, using brickwork and roofwork to compliment the CA and ASC, not CONTRASTING choices with the surrounding property as is the case with this Application. Any comparison with development prior to CA designation or in most of those in the Agent’s photographs is irrelevant.

11. The agent's inclusion of photographs in support of the application is most unfortunate. I have no problem with diversity in design, but ideas must have some quality and sympathy to their surroundings in or adjacent to Conservation Areas. Most of these photographs have been drawn NOT from Conservations areas, but many come from quick build, 'developer' estates. CA's are very different and should be seen as such. I note also that all but one have garages retained on the premises. The blue cladding the Applicant refers to in her email was in place BEFORE the CA was created.
12. Lastly, I attended the recent **Aldwick Parish Council Planning Committee** meeting where this Application was heard. After listening to presentations from the public, the Committee unanimously voted to Object to it, where all Members have first-hand experience of the problems expressed here.

I therefore contend that with no positive contributions nor preservation or enhancement of the CHASC or CHCA, nor respect paid to the views from within and without the CHCA, for all the reasons outlined above, especially those relating to Arun DC's own Policy Statements, **please REFUSE this Application.**

Yours faithfully.

Ian Jefferies

CC... Martyn White, ADC.Conservation Officer
& Ward Councillor Mrs G.Brown