

Mr & Mrs Lorimer
32 Brougham Grove,
Angmering
West Sussex,
BN16 4PP
Tuesday February 26th, 2019

Planning Department
Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
BN17 5LF

Ref: A/9/19/PL – Pound Place Angmering – Planning Application – Hallmark Care Homes

Dear Mrs Gardner,

We are writing to you with respect to the planning application reference A/9/19/PL for the construction of a new care home at Pound Place Angmering. As neighbouring owners and occupiers of an adjoining property on Brougham Grove we border directly with the site in question; with our house being the closest to the new building itself. We are happy to support the application and wish to bring the planning officer, and committees' attention to the following material considerations as part of this:

General

We feel that the proposed developer and their agent were very proactive and have taken on board our comments with the development of the concept design for the site, including previous modifications and the current arrangement. Specifically relating to the screening of windows, size of the and location of the building on the plot, and replacement of trees.

We feel that the nature of the care home will be both beneficial to local users (considering the lack of local care availability of this specific type).

Employment & Community Benefit

Due consideration should be given to the local economic benefit of the proposal.

- A good number and wide variety of new jobs to the local area.
- Benefit to local workers.
- A provision of jobs which other planned local housing cannot guarantee and may not provide.
- Local jobs in walking and commutable distance from public transport.
- Hallmark have demonstrated that they are a community centric organisation open, willing and wanting to work with the local community both now and in the future.
- On both occasions the parish council has recognised the overall benefit of this to the local community and supported the application.

Integration into the Public Open Space (POS) – Local Amenity

The current property which is and is very likely to remain privately owned by the extends beyond the end of brougham grove and is bordered by the privately maintained POS. We feel that the integration of this area is as well as can reasonably be expected for a privately-owned piece of land. Further consideration should be given to the following:

- The tree line north and south of this emanating section has recently (subsequent to completion of Swanbourne park) been the subject of a TPO by Arun DC. The authority has therefore set a precedent to dividing up the POS north and south contrary to the authorities view that this should be clear and open as highlighted at the previous planning application committee.
- The current outline planning permission in place for 18 houses at pound place includes buildings in the area emanating onto the POS beyond that of the relocated and smaller care home.
- A footpath linking the west to east and north and south of the Swanbourne park estate has already been naturally formed around pound place. There is therefore no reason to provide a further footpath or road link between the quiet cul-de-sacs at the end of brougham grove or lambert way.
- The land is privately owned, and it would be unreasonable to expect this to be 'donated', additionally given that the POS does not form part of any approved local plan the planning authority should not unreasonably expect that to be the case.

Trees - Appearance, Safety and Current lack of privacy

Our garden borders directly onto the south side of the property and is such subject to the cypress leylandii and to an extent the Pine trees which are set back further. These trees were recently subject to a blanket TPO which we feel did not correctly consider the impact on us as owners and occupiers of the adjoining property. We recognise the amenity value of trees in general but support the application to replace the trees with a more practically manageable native tree species which provides both sufficient screening, dwelling for animals and birds, and does not represent a risk to our property or persons in our garden.

We make the following considerations/observations in support of this:

- Having a developer whom is also the long-term custodian of the site as well will mean that they have in their best interests the area including the natural environment. And that it would be best served by a single owner whom cannot only afford to not only maintain but also has a vested interest in optimising the quality of the site too, something which is unlikely to be achieved with multiple residential owners
- The trees in the main overhang and overbear our property significantly; in most cases more than other properties along the border.
- Several trees are already leaning southwards towards our property and have damaged the owners' fence. In some cases, substantial branches/limbs have broken off in the past and fallen into our garden. The roots have also been exposed in places by previous construction work on the site. We feel either of these in isolation is a potential health and safety issue and they will inevitably result in the need for the trees to be removed anyway. Any new owners' liability should be given due consideration here. Given the complex nature of removing a substantial tree, the development of the site represents the easiest and safest opportunity to do this work, in a controlled CDM environment.
- The trees provide limited screening. Visibility is currently clear to our building and garden because of a lack of foliage/cover on the trees below 5m.
- On a recent visit to our property the tree officer highlighted that it was suspected that the trees would be an issue when the planning permission for houses was granted, yet the planning authority still saw fit to impose a TPO two whole years following the completion of the estate;

without giving enough consideration to the impact on the residents they correctly observed at an earlier date.

Additional Access - Highway Safety and Traffic

We support the removal of any further access be that vehicular or pedestrian at the end of Brougham Grove which the planners are seeking to link through to Lambert Way.

- A naturally worn footpath has already been worn between Brougham Grove and Alexander Avenue to the north and east around the privately-owned garden, no further pedestrian access should be required through to Lambert Way.
- The road at the end Brougham Grove has a blind bend directly next to the public open space which children frequent and cross to the adjacent Local Area of Play.
- Given the excessive speed of some vehicles already on the estate we would suggest that the linking of this road would directly increase the risk of a collision or worse – The welfare of the existing residents must be practically considered.
- In addition, this road has become a valuable space for additional visitor parking, since the Barratt Homes at Swanbourne park development has finished it has become apparent that there was a clear under provisioning of parking required on this part of the development.
- The road is not sufficiently wide to safely facilitate both parking and through traffic flow, the giving up of adjacent POS to support widening would not be acceptable.

Building Size and Position

The developer has amended his proposal several times based on feedback from both residents and the planning authority.

- We feel that the overall size and form of the building is in keeping with the plot and its position along with the adequate screening proposed will integrate well into the surrounding estate.
- The area of the plot occupied by the proposed building alone is smaller than that of the 18 houses and associated outbuildings previously permitted.

Health Care Provision

We live in an aging population, there is a significant lack of this kind of care home in our area; these needs must be accommodated.

Whilst there is some concern that this may overburden local health services it should be considered that this requirement for care will exist regardless of whether this is in the professional residential setting or at home.

Hallmark has indicated it will provide enhanced health care support within its facilities. This should reduce the overall burden on the services not increase it. Especially when considering the alternative that some 18+ houses with circa 60+ persons would require GP services anyway along with the other planned development in the area; the impact would be negligible.

Finally, we wish to reiterate in general terms our support for the application and have found that the developers themselves have to date been very helpful in answering our queries and accommodating our requests.

Sincerely,

Mr S Lorimer