

From: Maria Tomalova [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 September 2021 10:50
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: BR/119/21/PL

Dear James,

It was my pleasure to speak with you this morning.
I am more than happy to meet your client and you on the site and discuss how it can be done properly without compromising the surrounding development.
In principle the development for new units (up to three) is acceptable, the question is a form of proposed development.

It is unfortunate that we couldn't meet on the site earlier.
In the end I was able to understand the site and the proposed development, however, it took me a longer time.

As discussed earlier, I do agree with you that the residential amenity issue below is not strong enough, however, the visual impact and visual amenity issues are what I strongly would stand behind.

Visual amenities:

What you are proposing is not a mews but an inappropriate extension.
The proposed rear extension would visually dominate an existing building its immediate surroundings.
Its design fails to reflect the style of host building (there was a confusion if the proposed is an extension or an another building attached to the rear Of 73-75 Aldwick Road).
The extension would rise above the penultimate storey of an existing building.
It would occupy an extensive part of the yard.
It would upset the proportion of an existing building.
Would be visually intrusive/unsightly when seen in longer public or private views from ground and upper levels.

Residential amenities:

The rear garden of No 10 Stocker Road would be observed from the first floor windows of proposed with a distance of 7m.
The existing terrace and balcony of an host building would be overlooked from the first floor windows as well.
The living condition of prospective occupiers: Bed 2 of 2bed unit above 2 floors would be lit through the well between 73 and 71 with no outlook and proper ventilation (Fire escape?).

I do not know if you have had a chance to see the comments of Drainage Officer (see below). It would be useful if you consider it in the future in your proposal:

'No surface water drainage information has been supplied with this application, there seems to be no consideration of *sustainable* surface water drainage, the applicant states on the application form that surface water for the site will be disposed of via the Main Sewer. The hierarchy for sustainable drainage must be followed with infiltration fully investigated. A 5m easement from buildings to soakaways must be provided, in addition we stipulate that soakaways are kept 2.5m from property boundaries and 5m from the highway. My initial impression is that meeting these requirements will be tight but not impossible on this site. If the planner is not in agreement or would like further clarification of this then the applicant should provide a plan showing where a soakaway (or alternative

infiltration structure) could be located on the site as insufficient space is an inadequate excuse to not follow the hierarchy.

Infiltration should be investigated with winter groundwater monitoring (the length of the monitoring period should be agreed with us, expected to be for an agreed time between December and March) and winter infiltration testing (at agreed time and depth in strict accordance with BRE DG365). Failing to agree the necessary ground investigations can cause lengthy delays to a proposed development if further tests are required the following winter.

If infiltration is proven to be unviable then we would support a restricted discharge of surface water to the surface water sewer on Aldwick Road (as there are no watercourses in the vicinity of the site).

The applicant should be aware that our mapping indicates that the foul sewer crosses the site in the vicinity of the proposed extension, please consult Southern Water regarding this.'

Kind regards

Maria

Maria Tomalova
Senior Planning Officer
Directorate of Place



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk