Fwd: Planning Application Shopsdam Road AWDM/1263/16 and AWDM/1264/16

1 message

Matthew Porter <matthew.porter@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 12 October 2016 at 14:35
To: [redacted]
Cc: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear PJ Bouten and Charlotte Larco,

Please take this email as confirmation of receipt of your letter of objection, which has been passed to our support service team to process.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Porter | Senior Planning Officer Development Management | Adur & Worthing Councils
01903 221355

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Pieter-Jan Bouten** [redacted]
Date: 12 October 2016 at 14:03
Subject: Fwd: Planning Application Shopsdam Road AWDM/1263/16 and AWDM/1264/16
To: matthew.porter@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Dear Mr. Porter,

As Residents of Shopsdam Road and as Members of the Lancing Sailing Club on Shopsdam Road we are writing to express our opposition to the proposed development in Planning Applications AWDM/1263/16 and AWDM/1264/16.

Please see our letter attached. In particular we would like to bring to your attention a number of important technical issues with the application and plans, which in our view would invalidate the application.

Please note that I have tried to comment directly on the Adur website, but given that I got a message stating that my objection would be truncated, I have sent you our letter as a PDF. You can therefore ignore the comment of objection I made via the website 30 minutes ago, as it is exactly the same as in the letter.

With best regards

PJ Bouten and Charlotte Larco
10 Shopsdam Road
Lancing
BN15 8ES

Letter re Shopsdam Road.pdf
444K

Pieter-Jan Bouten and Charlotte Larco
The Beach House
10 Shopsdam Road
Lancing
BN15 8ES

10 October 2016

Dear Mr Peck, Mr Porter,

Regarding Planning Application Shopsdam Road AWDM/1263/16 and AWDM/1264/16

As Residents of Shopsdam Road and as Members of the Lancing Sailing Club on Shopsdam Road we are writing to express our opposition to the proposed development in Planning Applications AWDM/1263/16 and AWDM/1264/16.

In the first instance there are a number of technical issues with the application and plans that we would like to bring to your attention:

1. The certificate of ownership is incomplete and misleading. The Developers make the false representation, or at least give the false impression, that they own the land that belongs to Lancing Sailing Club. However they have not received any formal permission from Lancing Sailing Club to submit an application on land belonging to club.

2. The plans that have been published do not accurately show the land and the dimensions. The site boundaries in the Design and Access statement are highlighting a site which is significantly larger than the one that is owned by the Applicant.

3. The plans that have been published utilise views that do not exist and are misleading. Some of the drawings are deliberately shrunk to imply amenity space that in reality will disappear completely. The proximity of the development to its boundaries and the road is far closer than that indicated in the plans. This gives the impression that the development is smaller and less imposing than it would be in reality.

4. Inconsistent and missing scales are used between the plans: this is not only confusing but means that key distances and heights can only be estimated. We were unable to clearly find the height of the development stated in absolute terms and assess the impact on neighbouring properties. There is also discrepancy between the drawings and the design and access statement. It is also unclear and undisclosed at what distance to the beach-path the proposed Pavilion House would be built.

5. The proposed street view and street context are missing. None of the proposed plans show the impact on neighbours along Shopsdam Road, or the impact the West and East Houses have on each other. The mass and scale of this development will alter the area significantly and the impact that is confronting all surrounding neighbours has not been accounted for.

6. Having two applications for the same development is very confusing. We would like the Council to consider both applications jointly and also as a Major Development given the creation of 8 new housing units with 34 bedrooms in total.

For those reasons, we would like the Council to assess whether the Developers need to go back to the drawing board, put in a single application as a Major Development and restart the consultation process with the neighbours.

We would like to state our objections to the development under both applications AWDM/1263/16 and AWDM/1264/16 for the following reasons:

1. The eight proposed buildings by reason of their large size, unsympathetic design and use of materials would be an unduly dominant and conspicuous form of development which would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the surrounding built environment and detrimental to the character of the locality. It would fail to comply with policies AH7 and AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan and Policy BE1 of the South East Plan.

2. The Developer is seeking to turn one existing 3-bedroom house into eight new houses with 34 bedrooms in total. Having regard to the size and shape of the site and its relationship to the neighbouring houses, the proposal would constitute excessive overdevelopment of a contrived layout and design. The development is purely designed to maximise the returns to the Developers and would be out of keeping with the residential and environmental character of the locality, contrary to policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2) and South East Plan BE1.

3. The proposed height, scale and massing of buildings is not appropriately designed. As the buildings occupy almost the full extent of the plot, they appear to be wedged into this small site and have to rely on borrowed neighbouring land to achieve some impression of space around the structure. Its height and bulk would also represent an uncharacteristic intrusion along the East Side of Shopsdam Road where currently there are no buildings of a comparable scale and size.

4. The development lacks architectural merit and the materials proposed lack detailing. The standard of accommodation is poor with low quality design, small units and small rooms (some are not even complying with Building Regulations!). The design suffers from squeezing as many small units into as

tight a space as possible. The 4- and 5-bedroom housing units averaging just between 120 and 130 sq m would also be much smaller and bear little relationship to the larger footprint residential buildings that exist on the street.

5. Neighbouring residences on both Shopsdam Road and Brighton Road will all be subject to loss of amenity through being overlooked (windows and balconies) and through loss of light (three-storey buildings). Ironically the West and East houses have over 28 windows overlooking each other. There will also be increased noise from car traffic and from the balconies. The additional buildings are too high and will cast significant shade given its footprint, scale and proximity to the other houses on Shopsdam Road.

6. The proposed development provides for no amenity for its future residents, who will all be cramped together on a small site with no meaningful outside space.

7. The proposed development would remove the only bit of green on Shopsdam Road.

8. Shopsdam Road already has a major access problem. It is a very narrow and consequently easily blocked by poor or thoughtless parking. Maneuvring a car along the road is difficult enough when cars are parked there and it is made much more difficult for sailing club members if a boat trailer is attached. The creation of 8 new units in this development would increase the amount of traffic significantly. Shopsdam Road is simply too narrow to carry any increase in traffic, and will be narrowed further by wedging in 2 sets of buildings on either side.

9. The development provides for insufficient parking – effectively three quarters of a parking space (only making allowance for 1 small car) for 7 houses and none for the eighth – significantly below the guidance of 2 parking spaces (excluding visitors) for each 4-bedroom house.

10. The three additional parking provisions (falling short of the recommended minimum of two parking spaces per 4-bedroom house) have been made on land which is not owned by the applicant, but is owned by the Lancing Sailing Club. Informal discussions between the Sailing Club Committee and the Developers have taken place and are still ongoing, but no formal or legal agreement has been made between the Developers and the sailing club. Any final decision would be subject to a vote at a general meeting of the club. For these reasons, this part of the application should be considered misleading and invalid.

Furthermore, we would like to state additional objections to the development under application AWDM/1264/16 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed Pavilion House would be readily visible across the coastline and seafront - where it would appear as an isolated, discordant and incongruous feature in the local environment, entirely out of keeping with the character of our coastline and of no architectural merit.

2. The proposed Pavilion House at the bottom of the Applicant's garden has no direct car access or emergency vehicle access.

3. The proposed Pavilion House would set a dangerous precedent for development of green land at the bottom of each of the gardens adjacent to the beach – which would completely destroy the character of our seafront.

In terms of relevant precedents, we would like to draw the Council's attention to its and the Appeal Officer's refusal on a comparable proposed development on the East side of Shopsdam Road in AWDM/0678/12 "Demolition of existing garage and construction of 2 storey accommodation comprising ground floor bedroom and toilet, first floor living area with external terrace and ground floor parking space".

It is worth noting that the Applicant herself has tirelessly objected and protested against both the construction of both the sailing club building, as well as the houses built on 7, 8, 9 and 10 Shopsdam Road for reasons of: Design; Highway Access and Parking; Overdevelopment; Loss of General Amenity; Privacy Light and Noise.

As neighbours we are also concerned regarding disruption during the construction period and would be grateful for the addition of a planning condition for the developer or his contractors not to block Shopsdam Road with building materials or vehicles and for all contractors' equipment and vehicles to be stored or parked either on site or elsewhere.

In summary, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and be contrary to Policies AH2 and AG1 of the Adur District Local Plan which seek to ensure that proposals do not detract from, but are in keeping with, and enhance the local environment. The development would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which states that poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should be resisted.

On the basis of the above we do not believe that this development is appropriate.

Regards

[redacted]

Pieter-Jan Bouten

[redacted]

Charlotte Larco

cc. Cllr Ann Bridges, Cllr Clive Burghard, Cllr Geoff Patmor, Tim Loughton MP