Deborah DelGreco

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED 23 JUN 2011
TO
SEE NO
INSTRUCTION

From: Fleur Kreel [redacted]
Sent: 24 June 2011 11:02
To: Planning
Cc: Clive Roberts
Subject: WB/11/0047/FULL - representations about revised plans and request for it to go before the planning committee
Attachments: WB-11-0047-FULL - representations about revised plans.pdf

Dear Mr Roberts

WB/11/0047/FULL - United Reform Church Shelley Road, Worthing - Erection of a single storey extension to provide a diagnostic clinic and hydrotherapy unit

Following the submission of revised plans, I attach a copy of my further representations submitted to Council by copy of this email (and also by hand in hard copy to Council this morning).

I also respectfully request, as previously, that this application, though revised, still goes before the planning committee, which I would like to attend and register if possible to make representations.

Yours sincerely

Fleur Kreel
9 Chandos Road
Worthing
BN11 1TJ

[redacted]

A21F

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED 27 JUN 2011
On Comp. | In Report (D/C)
Addm. | Post Addm.

24 June 2011

Worthing Borough Council
Portland Road
WORTHING
WEST SUSSEX BN11 1LF

FAO: Mr James Appleton, Executive Head of Planning, Community and Wellbeing

Dear Mr Appleton

Representations concerning the revised plans for WB/11/0047/FULL – Erection of a single storey extension to provide a diagnostic clinic and hydrotherapy unit

United Reform Church Shelley Road Worthing West Sussex

Further to your letter of 10 June 2011, I have inspected both revised plans and find the re-location of the pool equipment and chemical store is acceptable as now shown to the north-east of the proposed building on plan 10.030 / 03 / D.

I further note the significant improvement by the re-siting of the proposed building further away from the southern boundary of the site with the residences on Chandos Road.

I raise the remaining objections and concerns as follows:

Although the revised proposed building is further from the southern boundary than it was, in that it appears to match the extent of the southern footprint of the existing portacabin, no measurements are given and the revised plans still suffer from inaccuracies.

Scaling off the plan indicates discrepancies of 600mm to the southern boundary and 700mm to the western boundary as between the proximity of the roof to the boundaries as shown on the roof plan (2.4m from the southern boundary and 1.5m from the western boundary) as against the dotted line of the eave-over shown on the ground floor plan which is shown 1.8m from or 600m closer to the southern boundary and 0.8m from or 700mm closer to the western boundary.

These discrepancies matter because the width and treatment of the boundary areas to the south and west of the proposed development are crucial to ensuring sufficient width for appropriate planting so that the development is not seen and the existing residential and environmental quality maintained.

The existing location of the portacabin is currently at 4.1m away from the western boundary. While I do not expect this distance to be maintained by the new development proposal, I repeat here (as previously represented) that the context of the development proposal is that the whole of the area currently occupied by the portacabin was once church garden, while the undeveloped area currently surrounding it is still given over to garden, albeit neglected. The history and existence of this part of the site as a church garden is clearly shown and referenced on the plans for WB/233/48.

Given the great sensitivity of the adjacent residences to the impact of the proposed development and the issue of overdevelopment of the site of what has been a church garden in a residential area, the absence of these certain measurements exposes residents to what I feel is an unacceptable flexibility in the siting of the final building, as well as a failure of the revised design as proposed to address the need to maintain the existing residential and environmental quality - specifically in relation to suitable garden planting areas to maintain balance the needs of residents, visual screening,

local environment for birds, bees and wildlife etc as mentioned in my original representations of 28 April 2011.

I submit that suitable planting would include at least one significant emergent deciduous specimen tree such as an oak (Quercus robur) planted in a key location ~~e.g. the~~ so that it has room to grow and spread its canopy as a visual screen over the proposed development, provide a feeding and habitat for birds, together with room for and planting of appropriate mixed shrubs and hedgerow plants such as Eleagnus, Cherry laurel (Prunus laurocerasus) Forsythia, Elder (Sambucus), Viburnum, Hazel (Corylopsis or Hamamelis). (Please see attached the kind of treatment I mean). These could be allowed the space to achieve a trunk and canopy which would require very little maintenance and with informal mulched access below as may be necessary from time to time.

Apart from the above, the absence of any detail in treatment of the building areas to the south and west and other details (such as, by way of example, external lighting, signage, security features and alarms, boundary details, opening hours), exposes us neighbouring residents to open slather from noise and night lighting levels from the proposed development which would be well above the existing quality residential amenity and well above what is acceptable for quality residential amenity.

Without detailed plans from the Applicant addressing these issues, I feel the proposal should still be refused or alternatively, effective, considered restrictions and conditions imposed on the proposal to bring the use of the building in line with the existing, long established residential amenity as to hours of operation, hours of servicing and access for deliveries, lighting levels from external and internal lights, security alarms we residents will be extremely vulnerable to the adverse impact / intrusion of commercial impact of the development on our domestic lives.

For example, it is insufficient to impose delivery restrictions without also a restriction both within the site premises and on the surrounding public roads feeding the site to prevent deliveries, collection loading and unloading service vehicles from pulling in at 4am and waking us all up, even if they comply to the letter with any actual deliveries, collection loading and unloading times long before they actually carry out a delivery.

I consider it incumbent on responsible planning responsibility for a development of this size, intensity and change to the existing residential amenity (albeit within an existing extremely broad use class) to be controlled by its proper, planned reception into the existing environment. That is changes made in the Zone A controlled zone, the non-Zone A lengths of Chandos Road, Grafton Street, Buckingham Road, Shelley Road, Salisbury Road and other nearby street for parking, traffic management, tree planting in the surrounding streets to restore the balance for residents and minimise the adverse impacts in keeping with the history, amenity and environment of the area.

As regards parking controls I submit as a minimum 24/7/365 parking for resident permit holders only - not only in Zone A but extending to the non-Zone A and to current no-parking areas of Shelley Road, Buckingham Road, Chandos Grafton, Salisbury, Portland and others.

As regards controls on delivery, collections, loading, unloading and servicing of the building I submit the need not only for restricted hours for those activities, but also waiting restrictions on the site premises of no more than 15 minutes outside the restricted hours and a no waiting/no stopping/no parking/no loading restriction, (resident permit holders excepted) on the neighbouring public roads.

As regards traffic control, I submit the need for changes to these roads such as with broadened pavement areas, speed restrictions / narrowed vehicle access / altered road surfaces (brick-paved for example) to slow traffic especially at the entry and exit to the roads.

As regards balancing residential amenity with the significant commercial intrusion of this proposed development, I submit the need for street tree planting in key locations on Chandos, Buckingham, Grafton and Shelley roads which should be eminently possible especially if key areas of the pavement are broadened in places.

I currently enjoy the peace and privacy of my home and garden. I feel about my home and garden that there are no words for how wonderful the sky, the sun, the bird sounds, the green of trees, the peace, quiet and privacy of garden and home during the day, the peace and darkness at night. Residents should not have to lose this when reasonable options remain for design and treatment of the surrounding spaces and lighting features, for other construction details and for the hours of permitted operation, delivery, maintenance and servicing of the proposed development.

The lack of respite from noise and ugliness of perpetual, overdeveloped under-regulated commercial activity leads to distress, stress and anger, loss of sleep, loss of recreation, loss of peaceful amenity leading to poor health, anti-social behaviour and a degraded social fabric – the very opposite of good planning, community and wellbeing

I will attach a copy of this letter to Mr Clive Roberts and request here, and will request of Mr Roberts that the revised plans still go to a Planning Committee which I would like to attend and if possible make representations.

I repeat the following grounds of those of my objections previously raised, amended as relevant to the revised plans

(1) Noise and disturbance

A. Activity, noise and lack of privacy associated with use (sound from people using the pool echoes and carries) access, service, repair and maintenance of and to the proposed development – all directly by my rear bedrooms and garden.

B. The issue of night time lighting levels both from external lighting arrangements and emanating from within the facility during hours of operation which are not divulged and after hours of operation if lighting is left on all night.

Basically there will be commercial levels of noise and light disturbance from the business activities of the proposed building as a hydrotherapy pool and diagnostic rooms in a location which is clearly domestic residential in character and for which no design detail has been shown to minimise or ameliorate. Rather, the presence and operation of the proposed development is still in close proximity to the southern and western boundaries with as yet unmitigated exposure to adverse impact on the residential neighbours.

(3) Loss of privacy and changed, degraded residential amenity and character

C. Without doubt the proposal as shown, without relevant detail as to will result in business & commercial levels of light at night time - whether from within the building while it is open for business or after hours for external security and maintenance - which will be significantly above the current acceptable residential levels at the back of our homes and gardens which are currently away from the business activity of the street at the front. One only has to observe the night time levels of light on Chandos Road and Buckingham Roads from the NCP car park, street lighting and the Fresh Egg office as compared with the current back garden lighting levels to the rear of our homes to see that internal and external lighting from a business operation would be a major imposition. Again, this will disturb the use of our homes, especially rear bedrooms for sleeping and gardens for relaxing in – whether of adults like myself who work hard each day and need the respite of their homes to return to, or new born babies and young children such as who live at No. 15 Chandos Road.

D. The extension of business activity of the main clinic to this additional building in size, use and particularly with a hydrotherapy swimming pool, will result in a very significant change and degradation of the private domestic character of the existing site location. Apart from the increased distance of the proposed building from the southern boundary (the actual extent of which is uncertain as previously noted), there is still nothing shown in the proposal which addresses the sensitivity of the surrounding residents to the proposed building and its commercial use, both during hours of operation which are unspecified and for servicing, maintenance, delivery, collections loading and unloading. It is well known that a degraded environment generates degraded behaviour and will only cause an increase in socio-economic disparity.

(4) Overdevelopment

E. The revised plans of the proposed hydrotherapy pool and diagnostic clinic still do not address the issue of integrating the development to its residential surrounds and does not indicate or allocate any space at all for planting to integrate the development to its residential site to maintain the residential garden character, for privacy and screening and to maintain the garden environment for local birdlife.

F. By the significant improvement of increasing the space to the southern boundary, the revised proposal is now 10 m^2 smaller in extent than previously proposed. However, it is still a very significant increase on the overall footprint of the existing portacabin. Given this increase which I now calculate is from 107m^2 to 152 m^2 (still more than 50% bigger) I submit that it is incumbent on the Applicant to better provide for integration of the proposed development with its surrounds. That is to provide for adequate garden area and appropriate planting to sensitively integrate the facility in keeping with the history and character of the site as the church garden (see plans to WB/233/48) and presently surrounded by people's homes and gardens, as well as a key site for local remnant wildlife habitat in the town (birds, bees and butterflies in particular).

G. As previously mentioned, the portacabin was originally erected as a temporary scout hall within the Church garden and since then for the past more than 65 years has always had unpaved, unbuilt, natural soil garden area around it to the full 2.4m to the southern boundary and more than 4m to the western boundary. This is clearly shown and referenced on the plans for WB/233/48.

H. The proximity of the revised proposed building plan to its boundaries is very tight, uncertain as discussed and in fact no planting is shown in any event. This lack in the revised plans of certain, adequate space and indication of planting around the proposed building degrades the current environment, is insensitive to the history and character of the site, the residential character of the block and does not at all integrate the proposed building to its site or location or complement the existing heritage asset of the church in its site. Whereas the Applicant here has design treatment alternatives for garden space and planting of deciduous garden shrubs for screening and to maintain and encourage the existing bird and insect life such as hazel, hawthorn, elder, Viburnum, forsythia, Buddleia lilac hazel and other such planting in keeping with such a church building of a specimen tree planting sited within sufficient space within the grounds such as horse chestnut (Aesculus sp.) or copper beech (Fagus sylvatica) or English oak (Quercus robusta).

(5) Effect on trees

I. In its decisions on this proposal I respectfully ask the Council to address the issue of the apple tree.

J. As previously mentioned, the applicant has answered "No" to the question "are there any trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or be important as part of the local landscape character". Yet the proposed building will intrude on the canopy and root zone of the old apple tree on the neighbouring block at no 14 Chandos Road formerly Wilton Villa. While it may be regarded as less important due to being a fruit tree, this tree is at least 50-60 years old, is present in old aerial photos of the site and is of a rare red-fleshed fruiting variety.

K. The apple tree is of great significance and value in the visual amenity and privacy between residences in this residential block. I am reliably informed by a specialist apple grower that this kind of apple tree "hates having its limbs cut". The canopy pruning and root zone interference which would occur for the proposed building at the very least places the survival of the tree at risk and is very likely to kill the tree. This tree is the only significant deciduous tree in this residential block bounded by Shelley, Buckingham, Chandos and Grafton Roads. It is a significant, valuable feeding area for local bird species especially small birds including populations of blue tits, speckled thrush, blackbirds, robin, chaffinches, goldfinch and others which are already declining in population through loss of habitat and feeding environments.

L. I respectfully submit that Council could ensure the protection of the root zone and canopy of the apple tree during construction and afterwards (from such as excavation for building footings, stockpiling of materials, compaction of the soil from heavy machinery and by avoidance of impermeable paved surfaces but rather to keep the boundary areas to the south and west as appropriately planted garden.

(6) Design, appearance, materials, character

M. The revised proposal develops what was once a church and garden in an otherwise residential block, to a major business facility with the built complex and parking area occupying almost half the block bounded by Buckingham, Chandos, Grafton and Shelley roads. The proposal is in effect a very significant business complex which will function like a private outpatient annexe to Worthing Hospital.

N. The Applicant has stated that the proposed building is not visible from any street yet it is clearly visible from Grafton Road. Indeed, the proposal addresses Grafton Road in its design and will completely change the quiet

residential character and amenity of that street to one with a large business complex directly addressing it and accessed by the public and by employees and maintenance of the pool diagnostic complex during and after unrestricted business hours.

O. The Applicant has declared that there is no hydrotherapy facility in the local area when in fact there is the well-established hydrotherapy facility close by at Henry House at 189 Heene Road. Unlike the subject proposal here, the hydrotherapy facility at 189 Heene Road is part of the main building, is set in a large garden and in its relations to neighbours the pool equipment is located well away from peoples homes and noise sensitive areas in that it is adjacent to the neighbour's double garage which itself is offset away from the neighbour's main residence.

P. The proposed use of alwitra membrane as roofing material will be visible from the upper floors of surrounding residences. Without appropriate planted screening as discussed above, it is completely unsympathetic to the materials and visual amenity of the church building.

(7) Traffic and parking

Q. There is no doubt that this proposal will have a significant impact on traffic generation and parking burden such that without appropriate changes to traffic management and parking in favour of residents, the amount of traffic movement in the local streets will become unacceptable and the competition for residential parking will change from difficult to impossible at all times of day all year around with no respite. As well, changes to parking and traffic management (discussed above) are necessary to curtail the noise from delivery and service vehicles driving into the street and parking or waiting (whether on the private premises of the development or on the public road) until a permitted delivery time. In other words, timed delivery restrictions on a development are of no use in controlling commercial noise in the absence of a "no waiting/no stopping/no parking/" restriction (resident permit-holders excepted), on our local streets which feed the proposed development.

(8) Planning policies

R. Policy H18 of the Local Plan that "Development, including changes of use and intensification of use which would result in an unacceptable reduction of amenity for local residents will not be permitted" will be directly and needlessly contravened and without any objective evidence of fulfilment of Policy BE1. The proposal clearly contravenes planning policy without any objective evidence that it fulfils any policy objectives, when there are design options which could fulfil all policy objectives.

S. The delegated decision of the previous application WB/10/0674/FULL identified the ward within which this application is located as "one of the most deprived wards in Worthing". By degrading our residential amenity especially in relation to the proposed business use and activity, its proximity and insensitivity to the residential surrounds, potential for night time light levels and destruction of peaceful sleep and peaceful enjoyment, this proposal will certainly further deprive us the residents – all for a *claimed* benefit to social and economic regeneration and community infrastructure which is completely unsubstantiated in fact. As well, any such benefit could be achieved without any conflict with neighbouring residential amenity with design, design detail and treatment which addresses the issues raised here and previously.

T. The proposal site is not in an area designated for change by the Core Strategy yet it will significantly change the predominantly residential quality of the block in which it is sited.

U. The proposal does not objectively conform with or balance any key, relevant planning law, policy statements or objectives such as:

   a. Ensure that "family homes are retained in appropriate locations and the quality and sustainability of existing housing stock has been improved"
   b. "improve the quality of life for all"
   c. "substantially reduce social and economic disparities whilst protecting and enhancing the environment and quality of life for residents"
   d.. "protect the settlement pattern and where possible enhance the natural environment within and around the town"
   e. how the local area wants and needs to change, striking a balance between environmental, social and economic needs.
   f. to "provide a balance and direction of how people want to see their towns developed and conserved for the future"
   g. to "protect the identity and setting of the borough"
   h. "reduce the carbon footprint, mitigate adverse impacts of climate change increase the biodiversity of the town, the green network ..."

On all the above grounds, I ask that the application yet be refused or at least heavily revised and controlled bearing in mind effective, appropriate design, construction and control conditions to address the issues raised (maintained visual amenity, quality residential amenity hours of operation, after hours noise and light levels, parking and traffic controls) in line with residential needs which are for: privacy and quiet at least before 7am and after 9pm Mondays to Fridays, before 8am and after 6pm on Saturdays and always on a Sunday, public or bank holiday.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Fleur Kreel
9 Chandos Road
Worthing
West Sussex BN11 1TJ

+ sketch enclosed.

Site Plan
1:100

Road

Footpath

N

Existing Tree

Existing Tree to be removed

Existing Tree to be retained

Existing Tree to be removed, due to proposed development

Existing Tree to be retained

Existing trees to be retained and protected from damage during construction works