

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 17 May 2017 09:03
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application R/64/17/PL
Attachments: St Mary's Close letter of objection.pdf

From: David Easton
Sent: 16 May 2017 15:26
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning Application R/64/17/PL

Objection letter

From: David Cross [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 May 2017 15:22
To: David Easton
Subject: Planning Application R/64/17/PL

Dear Mr Easton,

I hand delivered our objections to the above planning application this morning. In case it is easier to have an electronic copy in pdf format for posting on the website I attach a copy.

Could you please confirm that the application will be considered in Committee please?

Yours faithfully,

DE & WM Cross

**Hedge End
Hurst Road
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 3AP**

Mr D Easton
Case Officer
Development Control
Arun District Council

15th May 2017

Dear Mr Easton,

Re Planning Application R/64/17/PL Demolition of 1 No. dwelling & erection of 4 No. dwellings at St. Mary's Close, Hurst Road, East Preston.

We write to register our objection to the above application for the development of St. Mary's Close.

The original development of Hurst Road was conceived as a building scheme of relatively low density with only one dwelling per plot being permitted. This can be seen in the recent Google Earth view of Hurst Road as seen below.



The area outlined in red is the plot that is now subject to this planning application. We believe that this gives a much more accurate appreciation of the site than the submitted location plans.

Our reasons for objecting are listed below.

1. Density

The stated area of the site in the application is 0.21 ha representing 0.0525 hectare per dwelling. The applicants incorrectly state that this “will result in a density of 17 dwellings per hectare”. The correct figure is therefore calculated to be 19.05 dwellings per hectare.

The current density in Hurst Road, excluding the St. Mary’s Close site, is 10.49 dwellings per hectare. The proposal therefore would represent an increase in density of some **82%**.

This is not consistent with the Local Plan - D SP 1 Design including clause 13.2.2 “...limits on scale and massing ensuring that ‘new’ buildings are *harmonious with their surroundings*.”. Neither is it consistent with the Local Plan - D SP 1 Aspects of Design, including clause 13.2.15 Density ... “The density of proposals should be sympathetic to the site *and its surroundings*”.

A further consideration is the width of the proposed frontages. The current average frontage for dwellings facing onto Hurst Road is 19.90m. The proposed frontages for the development would be an average of 12.35m each. This represents a massive reduction. To be consistent with the current average this would indicate that there should only be 2.48 No. dwellings on the St. Mary’s Close site.

The submitted “Local Precedent” drawing shows two dwellings in Vicarage Lane, East Preston. The average frontage for these two adjacent dwellings is 21.45m, nearly double that for the 4 No. dwellings being proposed and cannot therefore be considered a precedent.

It can clearly be seen from the Google Earth view on the previous page that to cram 4 No. dwellings onto the St. Mary’s Close site would represent an inconsistent increase in density.

2. Aspects of Form & Design Quality

Every property in Hurst Road is currently of a unique design. The proposals in this application represent just two basic designs that are repeated by mirror imaging and with little variation apart from the rendering. Clause 13.2.2 of the Local Plan D SP 1 again states “that ‘new’ buildings are *harmonious with their surroundings*”. The designs proposed would clearly not be harmonious with their surroundings and would adversely affect the street scene and would have a negative impact on the character and appearance not only of Hurst Road but also of Station Road, East Preston Conservation Area.

Clause 13.2.3 in the Local Plan D SP1 for new buildings refers to “attention to proportions, massing, form and scale; and integration between the different parts of the building to create a coherent whole”. By cramming 4 No. dwellings into the available space we would argue that this proposal would not create a coherent whole and, again, would adversely affect the street scene both of Hurst Road and also of Station Road, East Preston Conservation Area.

3. Parking and traffic movements

Whilst the provision of 15 parking spaces might meet the statutory requirements it should be pointed out that Hurst Road is the only access for Oakhurst Gardens where there is sheltered accommodation with 149 elderly, and often frail residents many of whom require several visits per

day by carers. It is therefore not surprising that approximately 80% of traffic movements in Hurst Road are associated with transit to and from Oakhurst Gardens. It is not clear whether West Sussex Highways have taken this into account in their assessment. There have been problems with street parking in Hurst Road in the past which have resulted in difficulties for Emergency Service access and egress. The photograph below taken in Hurst Road with St. Mary's Close on the right shows how little space there is. On this occasion the ambulance crew had to get out to guide the driver through. Had access been required by a Fire appliance it would have been too wide and so would not have been able to get through.



It should be noted that although garages are counted as a parking spaces, of the 16 dwellings that are seen in the Google Earth view of Hurst Road, only 2 houses use a garage to park a car in. Indeed 7 of the 16 houses have converted their original garages into extra rooms. To compensate for this, and to enable free access to Oakhurst Gardens for emergency services, carers and residents, nearly every house has enlarged their driveways to accommodate at least 4 cars and in many cases many more.

The proposed development has a maximum of 15 spaces, including garages, and there would be no way to expand this in the future due to the cramped nature of the development.

4. Community Consultation Covering letter Ref GA/JS/0191

As mentioned in the covering letter, the applicants did indeed hold two meetings with representatives from Hurst Road. However, the letter completely misrepresents what was said. The main issue was the density of the proposals and Mr Hartnett was told very clearly on both occasions that we would object in the strongest possible terms if he went ahead with a proposal for 4 No. dwellings. Issues regarding parking were discussed but were by no means "the main issue".

For the above reasons we therefore would like to register our objection to Planning Application R64/17/PL.

Yours faithfully,

David and Maggie Cross