Debbie Johnson

From: Planning
Sent: 17 May 2013 16:32
To: Planning
Subject: Application Comments for AWDM/0372/13

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

Comments were submitted at 4:32 PM on 17 May 2013 from Miss Suzie Franklin.

Application Summary

Address: Olcote 1 Kings Crescent Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5LE

Proposal: Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2 no 3 storey dwellings (1 x 4 bed, 1 x 3 bed)

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Miss Suzie Franklin

Email: [redacted]

Address: 13 Kings Crescent Shoreham by Sea

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

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

Comments: I wish to object in the strongest terms to the above proposed development, on the following grounds: 1. Given the size of the plot of land involved, this is clearly over-development. The plot is currently occupied by a smallish 2 bedroom bungalow with an average sized garden partly taken up by a garage. The plot is not even as long as those occupied by the 3 bedroomed terraced houses in Kings Crescent, and barely much deeper. Putting 7 bedrooms-worth of development onto the site is therefore ridiculous. 2. If Planning Regulations aim to provide good housing for residents, then surely building family sized homes with such small gardens fails this requirement. Also building further homes backing onto a garage workshop and a Hydraulics business seems a strange choice of siting. The bungalow is low level and therefore is less affected. Also, we hear that small properties are in high demand in the rental market, so presumably the same is true generally. This property has been rented for a

number of years, the owners only returning now, it seems, to apply for planning permission and then leave again. 3. Residents like me would be forgiven for believing that they lived in an area which would not be the subject of any further development. It is why I chose to live here, after losing my last piece of south facing light to what transpired to be an unnecessary extension adjacent to my house in the centre of Shoreham. The proposed demolition of the bungalow will cause great distress to me and to other local residents, many of whom have children who play in their gardens. There will be a huge amount of noise, dust and commercial traffic movements (not least the terrible noise of reversing lorries beeping all day) and that is just for the demolition. After that, there will be months of 'more of the same', meaning loss of quality of life for many families. Also, those of us who already live here would be unable to hang our washing in the garden for many, many months, for most of the duration of the redevelopment. This is as unfair and unreasonable as the proposal itself is unnecessary. 4. The proposal for 3 storey houses is based, it seems, on the need to build dwellings that have no living rooms on the ground floor because of the perceived flood risk. I do not accept this as a reason to build houses that are, in scale, totally out of keeping with nearby properties. Looking east from Kings Gap, the properties are low level commercial ones, or bungalows, until you reach the flats much further down the road. To the west, and on the north side of the road, the properties are all 2 storey, and not particularly high ones at that. The properties up on the beachfront road are not in the same category at all, being on a totally different level and quite removed in distance. The proposed houses would stand out like a sore thumb, dominating this corner site which has no tall buildings on it, and would also block some of the eastern and southern sunlight to nearby houses. 5. Planning means thinking ahead. Those who have designed these proposed houses seem to have totally overlooked the fact that from the roof terrace of at least one house, we in the first three or four gardens 11-17 Kings Crescent, will ourselves be 'totally overlooked'. Our gardens are private, and much used by us, our children and our visitors. Also with no hedges or fences to absorb some of the sound, the noise from the roof terraces could be intrusive to say the least. Sound carries further when it's coming from higher up with no walls to act as baffles. For this reason if no other, I feel strongly that the Planning Department should have notified far more residents than they did. 6. Kings Gap is NOT a residential road. The bungalow at the end of the first leg of the road was presumably infill, and so has its garages in Kings Gap purely for reasons of space and access. That's all. It sits between two of the beachfront houses. The existing bungalow on the application site has had cars parked on its forecourt area during the 2½ years I have lived here, and until this week, I have never seen the side gate onto Kings Gap even open, let alone used. The cars are still using the front forecourt area at this time. Other than that, there is a Children's Home which uses Kings Gap for access day and night, and which is served frequently by a

full size refuse lorry. Then there is the road along the rear of the other houses in Kings Crescent, containing some 10 garages and about 9 more parking spaces. These all have to use Kings Gap for access and egress. The road is also used by local residents, their visitors and by clients of the garage and Hydraulics businesses immediately adjacent to the application site. I understand that the road has been photographed 'at a quiet time' when there was no-one parked there. Try visiting on Bonfire Night, any summer's afternoon and evening, and many other times, evenings and weekends particularly. It can be extremely busy. If the proposal is allowed, access and egress to the smaller new house will be difficult at such times, and then perhaps there will be a proposal to yellow-line the road, with benefit solely to the new house, and loss of amenity to the rest of us who will find even more visitors to the beach using our road. 7. The applicant describes Kings Gap as 'a baron cul-de-sac'. A baron is a member of the nobility, so I presume they mean 'barren' i.e. uninteresting or unprofitable. I cannot believe that building two oversized houses with small gardens will make this narrow road interesting and profitable (except for the owners of the existing bungalow). Nor do I understand the claim that the development will 'strengthen the approach to the Children's Home'. Are they offering to relay the road surface? Kings Gap is what is says on the packet. It is a fairly narrow gap through which traffic passes from the garages and Children's Home, which allows access for refuse collection, and which provides emergency access if needed. We don't need it to become residential. We don't need it to be glamorous or stronger either. And we certainly don't need it to be busier. 8. In these days of greed and opportunism, I fear that allowing this application will encourage more redevelopment of bungalow sites. Also, this is a quiet little backwater, give or take a few fast cars and racing cyclists. We would like to keep it that way, not because we are NIMBYs but for the very sound reason that to maintain the area as it is makes sense. The scale of the existing buildings is balanced. It ain't broke and it don't need fixing. If the existing house isn't right for its residents, it will be perfect for someone else. So there is an easy answer. Buy something else. But please, not out of the profits of spoiling things for the rest of us.