

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 19 July 2017 12:48
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: FG 198/16/PL
Attachments: 1 Sea Drive - revised plans objection 2.docx

From: Juan Baeza
Sent: 19 July 2017 11:41
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: FG 198/16/PL

[REDACTED]

Thanks

Juan Baeza Area Team Leader – Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37765 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737765 | E-mail: juan.baeza@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: sally henderson [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 July 2017 11:30
To: Andrew Wood
Cc: Juan Baeza
Subject: FG 198/16/PL

Please find attached my comments to be uploaded to the planning portal asap.

Sally

Sally Henderson

[REDACTED]

Objection

I reiterate my previous 2 objections and add the following comments in response to the revised plans which now show additional parking spaces in the underground car park and 1 west facing window has been deleted.

Not much has changed, so as the main issues were covered thoroughly in my previous objections, I will just address the latest changes.

The parking spaces shown are absolutely impossible to access, no swept path has been provided, nor sizes for the spaces so this new plan is entirely unsatisfactory.

Even if 12 accessible spaces were able to be provided, the government guidelines for a development of 2 bed apartments in a low-density area with assigned spaces is 1.75 per unit to allow for residents and visitors – this is 14.

(REF – Gov Planning Portal Parking Standards Annex A : Residential Parking standards, table 7)

(REF – Andrew Woods officers report to DCC 21st June 17 p. 35 – “the level of parking is proposed at 1 per flat and 1 additional visitor’s space”, ie parking proposed to be allocated)

I am surprised that no supporting columns are shown in the car park to support the 2 storey structure above – should these be required, which is highly likely, they will further impact on the meagre parking provision that is currently shown.

REF Gov Planning Portal Parking Standards General Considerations –

“Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate provision within the site, for parking, manoeuvring, loading and unloading to fulfil the operational requirements of the site. Operational parking space for commercial and service vehicles will depend on the type attracted to a development and should provide for manoeuvring space to enable vehicles to exit the site in forward gear.”

The minimum standing spaces quoted do not take account of the manoeuvring, loading and unloading. Those MINIMUM sizes are 2.4 x 4.8m for cars and 2.4m x 5.5m for light vans.

Light vans will regularly be required to attend the site to make deliveries and for works to repair and maintain the site. Nowhere are these vehicles allowed for within the site and they cannot be accommodated for in Sea Drive / Sea Lane.

Rigid vehicles require 3.5m x 14m and will be required by removals firms every time a new resident moves in / out. Nowhere are these provided for within the site and they cannot be accommodated for in Sea Drive or Sea Lane.

Disabled people will clearly not be accommodated for at the development – there is no disabled parking provision, or access to the apartments provided. Is this not against the

planning policy of constructing homes that will accommodate the aging population and the changing needs of occupiers?

Over development

This proposal is a huge overdevelopment of the site – cramming 8 small apartments onto the space of 1 chalet bungalow, building so far back, forward and to the side that the footprint is doubled.

The fact that the developer shows 10 windows as obscure acknowledges this. Almost the entire Western elevation, including windows to 2 master bedrooms and the living area to 1 flat, are obscure.

As neighbours, at whom these Western facing windows are aimed, we object to their presence – the sheer number of windows with the light and movement going on in the various different units to which they relate will give an overbearing effect of a number of different households encroaching on our privacy and enjoyment of our home and garden. The windows which are not obscure will give a direct line of sight into the whole of our garden and the rear of our kitchen family room – the main habitable room in our home. The planning officer feels that because there is some distance between the proposed window and our window, that is acceptable. My husband, children and I do not.

In relation to the obscure windows, no level of obscurity has been proposed or proposed to be conditioned. This would make any proposal or condition meaningless at protecting our privacy since Pilkington have 5 levels of obscurity and anything below a 5 still gives those on both sides of the glass a lack of privacy. A level 5 / satin white obscurity would be required for any benefit to be provided by the condition as well as all of these windows being fixed shut to prevent overlooking from an open window.

The developer's plans show the ground floor West facing windows as obscure and yet the planner is not minded to condition this – the developer is acknowledging the issues of overlooking, overbearing and proximity of the huge number of windows to us, why will the council not enforce the proposed mitigations to this ?