From:	Richard Allan <[redacted]>
Sent:	30 March 2023 11:00
To:	East 2
Cc:	John Burrow; Kevin Elliott; David Gilbert; Bruce Granger; Lawrence Harris; Janice Langley; Iain McNulty-Ringshaw; Troy Wade
Subject:	Ref APP/Y3805/W/23/3315854 - Appeal hearing documents
Attachments:	WRTA Appeal Statement.docx; Iain Ringshaw-McNulty Appeal Statement.docx

Dear Planning Inspectorate, (Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail)

Application No: AWDM/1314/22
Appeal No: APP/Y3805/W/23/3315854

I am writing on behalf of the Waterfront Residents & Tenants Association (WRTA) and non behalf of residents in the immediate vicinity of 'Land east of 3 Salt Marsh Rd, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5QJ' which a developer, Cross Stone (Shoreham), proposes to develop.
This development proposal is subject to a Planning Inspectorate appeal on May 23, 2023. (Your reference: APP/Y3805/23/3315854)
Cross Stone's proposed development site adjoins the existing Waterfront development and some residents' properties are in the immediate vicinity and so face the biggest impact.

Attached for your consideration is i) an appeal document from the WRTA and ii) a document from residents in the immediate vicinity.
It is the wish of the WRTA to be able to speak at the appeal, verbally summarising our objection to the development. This verbal summary will be done by myself, Richard Allan, of 11 Oystercatcher Apartments, 73 Salt Marsh Rd, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5QS.
Similarly, Iain McNulty-Ringshaw (5 Salt Marsh Rd, Shoreham-by-Sea) wishes to verbally summarise the objection from the personal perspective of residents in the immediate vicinity.

We look forward to hearing about the process to verbally summarise our objections on May 23rd to the proposed development.

Regards,
Richard Allan
Tel: [redacted]

WATERFRONT RESIDENTS' AND TENANTS' ASSOCIATION (WRTA) – APPEAL HEARING STATEMENT

Proposed mixed-use building set over 5 floors comprised of ground floor commercial space (Use Class E) and 34 new apartments

Application No: AWDM/1314/22
Appeal No: APP/Y3805/W/23/3315854

Introduction

I am Richard Allan a member of the Waterfront Residents' and Tenants' Association Committee which includes John Burrow (MRTPI retired) who has helped prepare this appeal statement. We are both residents of the Waterfront Estate.

The Association represents over 60% of estate households and is concerned that the original design concept for this site has been abandoned and that the new developer has come forward with an ill thought out and unacceptable scheme.

The original 2.69-hectare site, covered by the outline planning permission (AWDM/0935/13), included the car sales yard immediately adjoining the southern boundary of this residual site. This larger site provided for a hotel with a self-contained layout, appropriate level of car parking and suitable/safe servicing arrangements. That scheme also followed the building line of Salt Marsh Road and did not overlook adjoining gardens and terraces.

This scheme now excludes the car sales yard, leaving an ugly undevelopable site, and dispenses with these important design principles which the Council negotiated, and residents expected. It is of such high density, poor layout and design that; many existing homes are overshadowed and privacy compromised; adequate parking is unachievable; estate access is challenged and dangerous; existing soft landscaping is lost; and the opportunity to provide a well-designed entrance to the Waterfront Estate and to central Shoreham is significantly diminished.

This proposal is of such a size that it significantly departs from Adur Local Plan policies / Supplementary Guidance & Standards and Highway Authority standards.

Planning Concerns

<u>In terms of massing,</u> this scheme is out of proportion with the surrounding living environment and street pattern. The 34 residential units proposed for this small 0.11 ha site gives a density of 309 units per ha. which is over 6 times the minimum density standard of 35 dwellings per ha. set in Policy 22 of the Adur Local Plan. This compares with 49 units per ha. for the rest of the 2.58 ha* Waterfront Estate which provides proper levels of amenity space, visitor parking, café and retail provision. (*Including the site across Old Shoreham Road with a now approved 7-unit proposal, part of the original scheme).

Built out to nearly full site coverage, the rear elevation significantly protrudes beyond the established building line, reducing daylight and sunlight to adjoining residential properties. Although impacted by the original outline proposal, the social-rented housing block and houses opposite will also lose sunlight and daylight. The most affected properties being the adjacent and opposite houses and apartment block (nos. 3,5,7,6 and 8 Salt Marsh Road and Chalkhill Blue apartments)

High-level rear balconies compromise privacy across adjoining residents' rear gardens. Front balconies protrude beyond the Salt Marsh Road building line across Waterfront residents' parking spaces. As well as demonstrating poor design, this will be a dangerous obstacle for reversing high-sided articulated lorries which will be accessing the adjacent convenience store.

In terms of mixed use, diverse uses that contribute to community living and a live road frontage are welcome. However, this scheme provides poorly supported Use Class E activities, encompassing retail/gym/health/childcare/professional service uses with inadequate servicing and no parking arrangements. This will be situated on what will be a busy main road entrance to the Waterfront Estate, adjacent to and sharing access with an approved 7-day 7am-11pm convenience store. It should be noted that the same developer has been unable to secure the occupation of existing mixed-use space (retail and café) in the wider Waterfront Estate. So, there is some question on viability in this location.

In terms of parking, the scheme is extremely deficient, providing just 19 spaces against West Sussex County Council policy guidelines that suggest that 38 spaces are required. The undersupply will be exacerbated by the developer's stated aim to sell these parking spaces and the total lack of visitor parking.

In mitigation, the developer claims that new residents can use the current Waterfront Estate visitor spaces. Hyde Housing Association, which owns the spaces, has written to the WRTA to say that these are not available. Also, in mitigation, that new residents can rely on car club spaces 400 metres away. The pressure on the Waterfront Estate and surrounding road will be immense.

Furthermore, there is no customer or visitor parking provision for the new Class E uses apart from on the main road which has no waiting restrictions.

This will all add to the parking problems likely to come from the new convenience store and existing limited provision for the adjacent tenants in Chalkhill Blue Apartments and the surrounding neighbourhood.

In terms of design and layout, a major opportunity has been lost in providing a landmark architectural statement which would add townscape value to the Waterfront Estate and provide a prominent attractive gateway to Shoreham Town Centre. The agreed planning vision for the Waterfront Estate which portrayed trees and green planting across this frontage has been totally lost with this new scheme sacrificing the existing frontage and side return landscaping.

It is also not in keeping with the lower-level mews building style of the estate and is a floor higher than the Chalkhill Blue apartment block opposite. Essentially, it does not achieve the development standards set out in Policy 15 in the Adur Local Plan supported by Supplementary Planning Guidance under Development Management Standard No1. of that Plan.

With full site coverage the development has no outside amenity space versus 20 sq.m per flat unit specified in Local Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Instead, the developer is now providing what will be an unsightly bin store set-down area and cycle park directly on the entrance to the Waterfront Estate.

In terms of access, Salt Marsh Road is effectively a cul-de-sac with all estate cars, visitors, trades vehicles, convenience store customers, service vehicles and emergency vehicles needing access to the Waterfront Estate from this single narrow entry point with no footpaths from a main road.

This layout will:

- exacerbate potential traffic congestion at this entrance;
- introduce a safety hazard for manoeuvring articulated service vehicles and customer vehicles and pedestrians;

- promote temporary and double parking by residential unit visitors and by Class E space servicing and customer vehicles at the estate entrance, further obstructing access to the estate and convenience store and reducing the amenity of existing residents;
- generate noise and exhaust pollution for the residential units and balconies above, adjoining houses and the affordable housing block opposite, as well as for those living on the Old Shoreham Road, and;
- add to queuing tailbacks on the main road into the town centre;

Furthermore, the siting of a bin store set down for the commercial space, apart from being a potential eyesore, will create further dangerous vehicle blockages directly on the turning circle from the main road into the estate – potentially blocking access for emergency vehicles.

It should also be noted that the Waterfront Estate's roads are unadopted by the Council (through the Section 106 agreement) and are private, excepting access by residents' cars, pedestrians and cyclists.

Consultation Statement
The developer contends that there has been adequate consultation with residents on this scheme and has misrepresented the events leading to the submission of the planning application.

The WRTA did attend meetings with representatives of the developer, were asked to keep details confidential, were promised a public consultation event/exhibition in early 2022 which was not followed up by the developer and detailed plans were only made publicly available when the planning submission was advertised by the Council. These meetings were, at best, liaison and could not be construed as consultation. At all times the WRTA said that it could not represent the views of residents until plans were fully in the public domain. The late offer of a consultation event in October was turned down by the WRTA Committee because the planning application had already attracted 34 objections and was considered an attempt to justify an unacceptable scheme.

A chronological sequence of events has been scrutinised by the WRTA Committee and has been submitted to the Planning Department as a separate document to clarify matters.

Summary
WRTA expect this site to be developed but this proposal is badly designed, totally unacceptable and is detrimental to the amenity of existing residents, for the reasons specified.

The number of proposed residential units should only be considered in a lower density scheme which could be achieved by the re-inclusion of the adjoining car sales site. This would lead to an improved design, adherence to existing building lines, reduction in overlooking and loss of daylight, adequate parking and off-street servicing, the re-introduction of landscaping and a safer, less congested entrance to the Waterfront Estate.

Failing that, the number of residential units should be significantly reduced to enable a development of suitable scale which would achieve these basic design principles as required by the Adur Local Plan 2017.

WATERFRONT RESIDENTS' AND TENANTS' ASSOCIATION (WRTA) – APPEAL HEARING STATEMENT

Proposed mixed-use building set over 5 floors comprised of ground floor commercial space (Use Class E) and 34 new apartments

Site: Land East Of 3, Salt Marsh Road, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex

Application No: AWDM/1314/22
Appeal No: APP/Y3805/W/23/3315854

I am Iain Ringshaw-McNulty, an adjoining resident occupier of the appeal site, and also a member of the WRTA Committee. I have prepared this statement on behalf of myself, my partner and other undersigned neighbouring residents.

When we bought our homes, it was on the understanding that Salt Marsh Road was part of a masterplan agreed by the Council which would bring together mixed uses in an environment which would be well managed by a social housing developer.

We were not prepared for the Hyde Housing Association to sell the uncompleted parts of the estate from the approved outline planning consent to a developer who would throw aside the design principles correctly negotiated by the Council, with total disregard of adjoining occupiers.

Under that planning consent we were expecting a hotel with well defined, planned and segregated parking and servicing which could sit within its site and, which would not greatly impact on our day to day lives.

Instead, the adjoining site has been sold to a developer who is seeking to maximise the value of the site by disregarding the original scheme (AWDM/0935/13) and is seeking approval to a totally new proposal which falls significantly outside Local Planning Policy, Supplementary Planning Guidance, Highways guidance and has a major detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

In the first instance, that same developer also purchased the opposite facing vacant convenience store and immediately decided to intensify its proposed use by gaining permission for extending approved opening hours from 8am to 6pm to a 7-day, 7am - 11pm operation, including holidays.

This same developer is now seeking to develop the appeal site with 34 residential units with a proposal which is over density, does not adhere to the Salt Marsh Road building line and cannot achieve necessary parking and servicing requirements.

We have many concerns about the detrimental effect of this scheme on the amenity on our adjoining homes.

In the first instance, the size of the proposal and its 6.7 metres beyond the rear building line with high level balconies means that our gardens lose privacy and are overshadowed with our homes losing morning sunlight. We also believe that, in terms of density, it is a significant overdevelopment of this small site, being some 6 times, the minimum density set out in the Local Plan.

A bin room for the flats is also planned directly alongside our gardens. There is already a vermin issue in the area and this will only add to the issue for us, but not for the flats themselves.

Secondly, parking provision for the scheme is extremely deficient, with just 19 spaces for 34 flats, against West Sussex County Council highway policy guidelines that suggest that 39 spaces are

required. The undersupply will be exacerbated by the developer's stated aim to sell these parking spaces and the total lack of visitor parking.

Such under provision, without any visitor parking whatsoever, limited spaces allocated to the opposite Chalkhill Blue apartment block and that required for the approved convenience store will place pressure on the Waterfront residential road network and estate entrance. It will create double parking from the new residents and trades visitors unloading in the road, dangerous congestion at the estate entrance, the unauthorised use of designated estate visitor parking and blockages across our driveways.

These parking problems will be compounded by absence of user and visitor parking provision and inadequate servicing for the proposed Class E uses and the no waiting restrictions on the frontage main road.

It builds in potential conflict between neighbours and neighbouring uses, opening the door to anti-social behaviour. A suitably designed scheme would avoid this from the outset.

Thirdly, very limited thought has been given to the design and layout of this scheme. A major opportunity has been lost in providing a suitably designed building leading into the Waterfront Estate.

It is not in keeping with the lower-level mews building style of the Waterfront Estate, is a floor higher than the apartment block opposite and has frontage balconies projecting over parking spaces, beyond the Salt Marsh Road building line. Essentially, it does not achieve the design standards required by the Council's Local Plan policies and guidance (Policy 15 in the Adur Local Plan supported by Supplementary Planning Guidance under Development Management Standard No1. of that Plan).

Also, as a mews type development, there are no footpaths within the Waterfront Estate and these stop at the entrance. This scheme does not provide for the safe separation of pedestrians from convenience store customer and service vehicles and cars accessing the sole car park access to this development.

The original consent made provision for trees and green planting across this site's frontage and side elevation. This has been implemented but this is now to be ripped up.

Instead, the first impression of the Waterfront Estate turning from the main road will be an unnecessarily over bearing building with an ugly ill-conceived commercial bin store at the immediate estate entrance.

With 34 apartments, which will undoubtedly be home to small families, there is no outside amenity space standard against 20 sq.m per flat unit specified in Local Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance. This will encourage children to play outside on what will be a busy, congested and dangerous estate entrance and service yard.

Finally, in terms of access, our homes are located close to the relatively narrow entrance to the Waterfront Estate which serves as an access for estate cars, visitors, trades vehicles, convenience store customers, service vehicles and emergency vehicles. With a bin store sited on the front turning circle it is expected that vehicles will have significant problems leaving and entering the Waterfront Estate. We are concerned that his area will effectively become a congested, noisy and dangerous service yard and an uncontrolled parking area for this development.

We are aware that the hotel development layout provided for servicing and limited staff parking access from Salt Marsh Road but this was proportionate to the development and was all off street.

It should also be noted that the Waterfront Estate's roads are unadopted by the Council (through the Section 106 agreement) and are private, excepting access by residents' cars, pedestrians and cyclists.

_____

We understand that the developer promised pre-application consultation on this scheme. That has not happened.

We would welcome a site visit by the Inspector to assess the full impact of the size of this scheme on our homes.

We desperately hope that the Inspectorate will reject this appeal and require the submission a scheme that does not overshadow our homes, has adequate, safe and properly planned off street parking and servicing and provides a well-designed entrance to our estate and Shoreham Town Centre.

Signed:

Iain and David Ringshaw-McNulty No. 5 Salt Marsh Road
Gillian Fountain No. 3 Salt Marsh Road
Claire Baert and Graham McAllister No7 Salt Marsh Road
Jonathan Williams No 9 Salt Marsh Road
Troy and Fiona Wade No 11 Salt Marsh Road