Debbie Johnson

From: Planning
Sent: 04 August 2012 15:46
To: Planning
Subject: Application Comments for AWDM/0851/12

Planning Application comments has been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:45 PM on 04 Aug 2012 from Miss Arrna Scott.

Application Summary

Address: 26 Roman Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex BN42 4TP

Proposal: Detached 3 bed house at rear of No. 26 and accessed from parking area at rear of No's. 180B-180H Old Shoreham Road

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Miss Arrna Scott

Email: [redacted]

Address: 88 Eastern Avenue Shoreham by Sea

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments: Basic Planning Rules Overdevelopment and Space around properties When planning was allowed for the roof extension at 26 Roman Road, REF SW/20/02/TP, in 2002, a gable and balcony were catered for in the rear. In 2003, planning was allowed to the east of the house at 26 Roman Road, REF SW/32/03/TP, for a single storey, linked "granny annex". It, in effect, is a 2 bedroom house, currently attached to the rear of 26 Roman Road, and housing the mother of Mrs C Johnson. Is not the above absolutely indicative of overdevelopment of this one residential site? In the supporting statement for planning, Griston Cross Lahaise have admitted that their plan only allows 15.6 metres from the annex, which, as far as I understand, is 6.4 metres less than is allowed for space between houses and flats. Are they asserting that the annex is not now part of the house at 26 Roman Road? If so, then they are planning to build a third property on the

same plot of land and the "annex", as a separate property, must contravene ALL the planning guidelines with regard to space around it. If, however, they are suggesting that the annex is still part of 26 Roman Way then the proposed new house will definitely be too close to the rear of the house at 26 Roman Road. Should the proposed new house be built according to the drawings submitted, then how would its own light and privacy requirements be fulfilled, when it will be overlooked from the rear balcony of the roof extension of 26 Roman Road; only ameliorated by the proposed (and temporary) planting, reducing light in the already small front garden? Parking As has been mentioned by other neighbours living on Old Shoreham Road, Roman Road and Greenfield Crescent, the upheaval of the building works generated in developing the old Windmill pub caused 18 months of dust, dirt and parking congestion. As Roman Road is a cul-de-sac, there was also significant obstruction to any emergency vehicles potentially required at the top of Roman Road. That is without mentioning the complete denial of access to vehicles as large as a fire engine, which probably still pertains. In constructing the Windmill property the weighty and large vehicles managed to significantly damage the Roman Road infrastructure, whose repair and expense was left to the County Council and the ratepayers. Since then, the single parking space per dwelling at the rear of the Windmill development, some of which comprise 3-bedroomed houses were quite inadequate and, in my humble opinion, should have raised flags of alarm at the time of passing the plans for that development. The present limitations of parking space is already causing congestion so bad down Roman Road that the residents there are finding it hard to manoeuvre their vehicles in and out of their own driveways. There is also an issue that the overspill of vehicles from the Windmill development causes parking problems on Old Shoreham Road and in Greenfield Crescent, where the residents' vehicle manoeuvrability is also compromised. In an area of previous neighbourliness, there is now an underlying tension between established residents who are never sure where they will be able to park. It seems, from some of the new residents that there is a burgeoning tension between them over the same problem. Considering the above, it seems to me that the reduction of a car parking space in the Windmill development to make way for a lone space for a new 3-bedroom house can only exacerbate the issues related. It may also lead to further local antagonism, as the Windmill residents pay for the maintenance of their (presently) own parking area; which will be encumbered by further potential construction works before being reduced by at least one parking space. Neighbour Amenity Reduction in parking facilities to the area for the neighbours has already been mentioned extensively, as has emergency vehicle access and the overlooking of established homes. In terms of the views of neighbours, a major benefit of living in this vicinity is the fact that, not only does no-one overlook one another, but, especially from the homes bang on the main road, the rear views offer a peaceful, serene and quiet, almost rural

backdrop to the residents' lives. This will be shattered for many of us, with the building of a house, a few feet from our back gardens in all directions, ruining this haven for so many of us. There are several beautiful plants in the back garden of 26, whose roots or entire existence may be threatened by construction there. We are considering asking the Council's tree expert, Jeremy Sergeant, to assess the endangered trees and shrubs before a planning decision is made. A few of the neighbours are so concerned about this that we are willing to apply for a Tree Preservation Order on any eligible trees and would urge the Council to take this into consideration before allowing consent to any of the plans. I hope the above gives the Council Planning Committee pause in their deliberations and cause to refuse the Application forthwith. If not, then to at least take the decision to Committee before any final decision is made. Yours sincerely Arrna Scott On behalf of AR & JA Kaye 184 Old Shoreham Rd BN42 4TR