Gmail by Google

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Letter of opposition to AWDM/1742/18

1 message

Barbara [redacted] 27 January 2019 at 12:07
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

LETTER OF OPPOSITION TO THE CECIL NORRIS HOUSE DEVELOPMENT, RAVENS ROAD, AWDM/1742/18

FROM: Barb O'Kelly, 24 Fairfield Close , Shoreham, BN436BH

DATE: January 27, 2019

While I welcome the provision of social housing, I object to this development in terms of lack of adequate parking , design and overdevelopment.

The box like design is not in keeping with the surrounding Conservation Area. The speckled hen eggs brickwork and dominance of brown colouring is dark and oppressive. The majority of the surrounding buildings have gentler and lighter colouring. The design is very similar to that of the first proposal by the same architect for the Howard Kent development along the Brighton Rd. which was very unpopular in terms of design. When questioned at the consultation evening about the reasons for such a box like, dark design for that development the reply was that it was in keeping with the industrial history of the harbour area on Brighton Rd. So why is a similar design being proposed for a residential area? Given the opposition to the Howard Kent design, I am baffled as to why the council felt that these were the right architects for this site.

This is an overdevelopment of the site and does not take into consideration the position of the buildings on the adjoining plots. The building occupies a disproportionate amount of the land, with only 40% given over to Grounds and inadequate provision for parking.

There is no indication of who will be responsible for the upkeep of the green wall and who will pay for that upkeep. Will it be the tenants, tenants from the Councils waiting list for housing who may well have limited incomes? The minimum requirement for upkeep is at least once a year to prevent weeds and unsuitable plants from taking root. Will there be a built in watering system. What additional costs will be entailed by including this design feature? A green wall was also a feature of the original Howard Kent design and the same questions were raised. Has the council planning department costings for the installation and upkeep of this design feature?

PARKING SURVEY FOR CECIL NORRIS HOUSE, RAVENS ROAD AWDM/1742/18

I would like to raise the following concerns about the parking report done by GTA .

1. Will there be electric charge points?

2. It was unclear whether the total number of spaces available for each road included the time limited one hour spaces.

3. Hebe Road – Only parking on the south side was observed. The report stated that there were spaces available on the north side. Anyone familiar with the road would realise this is part of a bus route and that people never park on the north side. It is too narrow. The number of available spaces would therefore be considerably less than calculated.

4. Mill Lane – It was observed in the survey that parking is primarily on the north side. The road becomes very narrow and there is no footpath on the south side. It is unclear whether they included spaces on the south side .

5. Western Rd. – The report states that there was parking on both sides. There is no mention of the spaces which are time limited so there is no way of knowing whether they were included in the available spaces total. The report claimed there were 30 vehicles parked at 7pm, amounting to 52% occupancy. In contrast, there were 27 vehicles parked at 08:55 amounting to 94% occupancy. At 18:25 there were also 27 vehicles parked, amounting to 47% occupancy. **There is a definite discrepancy in the figures**. At night the report stated that there were 30 spaces available, but this included parking on both sides. They have not reduced availability in spite of stating that parking on both sides may restrict traffic.

6. Gordon Rd. – There was no mention of the time limited spaces so there is no way of knowing whether they were included in the vacancy rate.

7.Ravens Rd. – The report on the night survey states there will be 46 free spaces and then goes on to state that an additional 36 cars could be accommodated in the GRAND AVENUE streets or Queens Gardens. Where is GRAND

AVENUE in SHOREHAM?

8. Pond Rd – The report stated that there was to be some low rise office development with off street parking. I am unaware of this development. The parking on Pond Road is time limited.

9. Why/ how have the developers calculated that only 3 additional spaces will be needed above the 5 being provided. This is less than what the parking calculator advises. With 15 flats is it really feasible that only 3 additional spaces will be needed, that there will be only 8 cars at the development? This is a totally unrealistic estimate.

10 . Doing a traffic survey in the middle of the night does not take into account availability when people are returning from work or a night out. There is no way of knowing the demographics of the residents. Older people, who are the most likely to own and need a car, will not want to be walking a distance in the night from their parking place to their home. Has the issue of personal safety been taken into account?

11. The West Sussex Local Transport Plan states that on and off street parking in Adur is insufficient to meet the current demand, particularly near railway stations and shopping area. This development will contribute further to the traffic "churn" and cause further air pollution as people drive around seeking a parking place.

This report contains a number of inaccuracies and should not be considered valid.

A DECISION ON THIS DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN USING INACCURATE INFORMATION.

Yours faithfully,

Barb. O'Kelly