[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Haydn Jones [redacted]
Sent: 12 July 2019 13:18
To: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Kingston Parish Council comments

Dear Anita

We write in response to the Parish Councils concerns (12 July 2019) with regards the revised proposal, which they sadly do not seemed to have studied in detail.

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 been reduced further and the revised proposal equates approximately to **25%** of the site area. 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. However the revised proposal has been greatly reduced in height on the west side and is now considerably lower than White Lodge. The height of

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL K/7/19/PL

the proposal is 9m which is the same as the recently approved 3 storey Spring Tides (K/40/18/PL).

We agree the garage is further forward than the existing, which was based on the agreed location and approved former Spring Tides scheme (K/11/16/PL). We cannot see that this location has any detrimental effect on the street scape and we again attach a Ground Floor Plan which shows the space provided for visitor car parking without over hanging the verge.

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 statement takes no consideration of the length of the plot or its relationship with the greensward or properties to the east. The revised proposal southernly extension has been greatly reduced in detailed consultation with the planning department and is now level with large built structures to the west. Notwithstanding this the proposal, on this very long plot, is now **28m** away from its southern boundary and the greensward. This is considerably further than many properties east and west. In comparison

- Spring Tides – 8m from greensward.
- White Lodge – 26m 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.*

It is unfortunate that The Parish Council have not engaged with the consultation process and considered the revised proposal in detail. The revised proposal have greatly reduced the original proposals to propose a development that is considerable smaller than similar approved schemes on the estate and existing properties and that fact in itself is a material consideration.

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.*

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.

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. The scheme presents no more overlooking issues and the screening from balconies has been integrated into the design and not a stuck-on after thought as sadly often occurs.

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL K/7/19/PL

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.*

The revised proposal clearly indicates there is adequate parking spaces for 6/7 cars (2 in the garage; 3/4 in the enclosed drive; 1 outside the garage without overhanging the verge). For clarity we have indicated them on the attached ground floor plan.

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) is the same height but of greater mass covers and 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 complement the future developments of this end of Gorse Avenue. If there is any further information that you require, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Haydn Jones | Director

saville jones | architects

saville jones consultants

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Saville Jones Architects, 74 Victoria Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 1UN

[redacted]

www.savillejones-architects.com