11 March 2019

Kingston Parish Council's
Mrs V Knight
33 The Ridings
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 2TW

Dear Mrs Knight

Little Deerswood, Gorse Avenue, Planning Ref K/7.19.PL

We write in response to the Parish Councils concerns with this proposal and would like to explain and clarify some misconceptions. We would also like to invite yourselves and any members of the council to meet on site to review the plans and discuss any issues.

With regards the concerns raised in your letter to Arun District Council of the 26th February 2019 we would like to provide the following clarifications;

1. *"The proposed development is out of scale to the existing dwelling and by reason of its increase in scale, width, height, bulk and design will constitute overdevelopment of the site. This includes a rise in roof height and shape to create a 3-storey dwelling. The roof height is higher than the neighbouring property to the west and the building (garage) is further forward than the existing and neighbouring garage."*

   The proposal has a foot print of 320m2 on a plot with an area of 1180m2 which equates to approximately **27%** of the site being covered. There are many properties on the Kingston Gorse Estate which have greater density. However, for ease of comparison the recently approved Spring Tides (K/40/18/PL) to the east of the site has a footprint of 470m2 on a plot with an area of 1080m2 which equates to approximately **43%**.

   We would also like to clarify that the proposal is not as wide as the existing property, which is built up to the boundary and attached to White Lodge to the west. The scheme has been designed to have space on each side of approximately 2m and make the house clearly detached.

   The proposal does have 3 floors which we have discussed in our planning statement. The height of the proposal is 9m which is the same as the recently approved 3 storey Spring Tides (K/40/18/PL) and is approximately 100 – 180mm (4 – 7 inches) higher than White Lodge.

   We agree the garage is further forward than the existing, which was based on the agreed location and approved former Spring Tides

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL K/7/19/PL

scheme (K/11/16/PL). We cannot see that this location has any detrimental effect on the street scape and the attached revised Ground Floor Plan (1703 SK 36C) shows the space provided for car parking.

2. *The proposed development will overly dominate the street scene of Gorse Avenue and this will adversely affect the character and visual amenity of the area.*

The proposed scheme does not fill the site and more than half of the building when viewed from the street is lower than the existing property and the adjacent White Lodge. We strongly feel that it will not, overly dominate the street scene, any more than any other property on Gorse Avenue and would like to understand what this assessment and concern is based on?

3. *The site backs onto the greensward running along the edge of the beach, which is a popular coastal footpath and leisure route for residents and visitors. This effectively means the property has a frontage to both north and south. The proposed dwelling when viewed from the greensward is considerably forward of the building line of the neighbouring property to the west.*

The building does extend further south on one narrow east wing however, this does not mean it is of detriment to the greensward. The property, on this very long plot is still **23m** away from its southern boundary and the greensward. This is a lot further than many properties east and west. In comparison

- Spring Tides – 8m from greensward.
- Woodend – 15m from greensward
- Tumbley – 15m from greensward.

4. *For the reasons given in points 1 - 4, the proposed development will be overbearing on the neighbouring property.*

We hope the above, factual clarifications, assist The Parish Council in appreciating, why the proposal should not be considered over development or over bearing.

5. *The proposal is intrusive to the privacy of neighbouring properties. Council is concerned that there are overlooking windows and balconies and potential access onto flat roof spaces. Council is also concerned that the ground floor level (including the pool and immediate outside area) are raised up above the garden level so that views across other properties/gardens are greater than can be expected from garden level.*

We would draw your attention to Section 5 of the Planning Statement which describes how the proposal has been carefully designed to minimise issues of privacy and overlooking well within good practise and planning guidance criteria.

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL K/7/19/PL

The revised scheme has also been greatly reduced in size and the east wing reduce in length to a point where the balcony and kitchen windows will be viewing into the properties own garden and are over 12m from the west boundary and over 22m from principal windows of neighbours.

We can also confirm that the garden and pool are not raised above the existing ground level. The site plan indicates steps descending to a sunken rear garden to shelter from the wind. This would be part of any garden design to be developed further. We have attached a revised Site Plan (1703 SK 44C) which clarifies the point.

6. *This is a large 5-bedroom property with only two car parking spaces shown (both within a garage) and Council is concerned that this is inadequate for residents of the proposed dwelling. It also not take in to account visitor parking. There is no on-street parking allowed in the vicinity. There is no measurement of the section of driveway in front of the garage and within the curtilage of the property. If the drawing is to scale, Council considers that parking outside of the garage will overhang the crossover which is not acceptable as this will affect road safety and the character of the street scene.*

We apologise if our ground floor plans did not indicate the full extent of parking but the revised Ground Floor Plan (1703 SK 36C) indicates the proposed 6 spaces. Two with the secure curtilage, two in the generous garage and space outside the garage before the crossover.

7. *A pool house is shown on the plans but there are no dimensions or designs shown or an explanation/condition re usage.*

We confirm that the pool house is 4.5m x 4.5m and is to be used for pool changing.

8. *For all of the reason above the proposal is contrary to the Kingston Neighbourhood Plan policy KNP7 re Design and Development.*

As stated in our Planning Statement, Section 2 and 2.3 the many houses which have been built and or are approved which are similar in architectural design, form and mass would suggest that the proposal is wholly appropriate and concurs with Local Policy DDM1.

In comparison the recently approved Spring Tides (K/40/18/PL) neighbouring the proposal, is the same height but of greater mass,

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL K/7/19/PL

[redacted]

is proposed to be built only 500mm from the site boundaries and covers nearly twice the area of plot.

We therefore consider the proposal will compliment the future developments of this end of Gorse Avenue. If there is any further information that you require, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Haydn C Jones
Director

cc. Anita Gardner – Arun District Council

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL K/7/19/PL