

Saffron Lodge
46 Kingsway, PO21 4DN
My Ref: AW/85/18/HH-2

14th September 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) Substitute Documents**

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

Whilst not situated within the CHCA, this house is immediately next/adjacent to it and as this Application states, "This Application **may** affect the character and appearance of the Craigweil House Conservation Area." I strongly say again it **DOES** affect the CA.

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

LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES.

1. In Arun DC's CURRENT District Plan, there are Policies designed to make '**positive contributions**' where '**to preserve or enhance**' is the requirement for Conservation Areas. As stated above, whilst this application site is not within a CA, **the fact that it abuts the CA 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. Whilst the Substitute Plans change the profile of the roof-work, creating a pair of hipped sections, the effect when viewed from the north still infills the present space at 1st floor level.
In the **Conservation Area Statement** for the CHCA, at (2) Description of the CA, in para 2 it says '**There is generally a low-density character in the estate, particularly in Kingsway**'. Then under 'Kingsway', the third para reads '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.**' This application is ignoring these criteria relating to '**infilling at first floor level**.'
2. **Policy D SP1** in the District Plan 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 Policy states '**but reflect the characteristics of the site and local area in their layout, landscaping, density, mix, scale, massing, character, materials, finish and architectural details.**' Several of these are ignored here. '**Development proposals should have been derived from a thorough site analysis and context appraisal.**' I see none of this forthcoming.
3. In the **Design sections of the District Plan**, there are **so many paragraphs** highlighting the need to respect the characteristics of the area and the need to 'respond to locally distinctive patterns of development' (13.2.7) and to '**Respect, Improve and ENHANCE** the existing

surrounding environment' (13.2.6) **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 effect with the large infill over the replaced ground floor garage space.

4. **In the District Plan, Para HER DM3a stresses the importance of the 'spaces between buildings'. The proximity to Number 52 Kingsway does away with such consideration, especially the first-floor extension. Before that, the Policy talks of 'preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and that permission will only be granted for proposals within a setting meeting the following (6) criteria.'**
5. **HER DM3b 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, BUT it is immediately adjacent to it and therefore must surely reflect this policy requirement. I contend it does not.
6. **HER DM3f 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.****
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. According to the **ADC Supplementary Guidance on PARKING STANDARDS**, a 4 bedroomed house requires plans to provide a total of at least **3 car parking spaces**. In this case, the cars will need to be parked within the small front garden. Families with children, this family has three, is most likely there will be more vehicle parking required in the near future. I question whether there is enough space for three parked cars in the small front garden and turning space is out of the question. Permanent parking will therefore be on view 24 hours in the day. 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. Such conditions should not prevail in a Conservation Area.
8. CHCA has Article 4 Directions attached to it. In the CHAC Statement, at(3) **Opportunities for Improvement**, it says at b) The use of Article 4 Directions to:- and at (iii) **Prevent the hard standing of front gardens and verges.'** **This is ignored by this Application.**

OTHER MATTERS.

9. We still have no indication as to the colour, texture or type of cladding materials. Study of the Application gives 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. **But we still lack detail of what is proposed.**

10. 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 previous 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.
11. The work to No.53 Kingsway, opposite this site, recently redeveloped, presents a much better design profile, using brickwork and roof-work to compliment the CA and previous 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 that remain is irrelevant.
12. 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.
13. I have contacted by email the Case Officer recently, asking for the Conservation Officer and the Conservation Area Advisory Committee to review the Substitute Plans in view of their initial, considerable concerns. **Disappointingly, I have not had either an acknowledgment nor a reply to that enquiry/suggestion. It would at least have been polite to have done so.**
14. Lastly, I note that **Aldwick Parish Council Planning Committee** have again twice (22th Aug and 13th Sept) reported an **OBJECTION** where this amended Application was heard. 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 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