

Caroline Grist

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 November 2024 16:14
To: Caroline Grist
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Planning Application Reference: DM/24/2637
Attachments: Attachment A.JPG; Attachment B.JPG; Attachment C.JPG

[REDACTED]

Planning Application Reference: DM/24/2637

Address: Land To Rear Of 94, 94a, 96 And 98 London Road East Grinstead, West Sussex RH19 1EP

Proposal: Proposed two storey building to be constructed to house three ancillary commercial units.

Case Officer: Caroline Grist

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

Incorrect information in the application

- The Design Planning and Flood Risk Assessment document states that there is a low risk from Surface water. This is incorrect as water from the property in the proposal floods into the garden of 16 Dallaway Gardens when there is heavy rain – please see attachment A (an enquiry was also made to the Council Highways department on 20/09/24 with regards this flooding). There is a concern that development work will exasperate the issue further
- The application states the development cannot be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land. This is incorrect, the development will be seen from outside 16 and 17 Dallaway Gardens – please see attachment B which is the view from the pavement outside numbers 16 and 17 Dallaway Gardens. Highlighted in red is the approx.* height and width of proposed building.

Privacy/overbearing/overshadowing

- The site of the proposed building sits on a slope (approx. 1.5m) above 16 Dallaway Gardens (the property that borders to the south) so in effect the proposed building will actually appear to be closer to a 3 storey building rather than a 2 storey building when viewed from 16, 17 & 18 Dallaway Gardens. This is especially the case as the proposal is to build it very close to the property boundary. Please see attachment C which gives the approx.* (conservative) scale and view from the rear of 16 Dallaway Gardens.
- Given the height of the slope and the closeness to the boundary, the proposed building would be overbearing on the property of 16 Dallaway Gardens. Please note that the current tree cover between the properties is not sufficient to block the current view so when trimmed from both sides there will be very little left in terms of foliage to obstruct the view of the proposed building – this cannot be stressed enough. If this proposal goes ahead the owners of 16 Dallaway Gardens would have to repurpose their garden to plant trees/hedges at considerable cost and loss of garden/biodiversity in order to try to mitigate the privacy/overbearing issue.

In all, the proposed building would be visible, and to varying degrees, overbearing to residential properties 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 & 20 Dallaway Gardens

- The external side staircase on the proposed building will be high enough and close enough (estimated 10m) to provide clear views into the rear garden, conservatory, kitchen and rear bedroom of 16 Dallaway Gardens.
- The proposed building is immediately to the south of the residential property of 94a London Road by an estimated 4 metres. The proposed building would therefore significantly overshadow this residential property.
- Any additional movement/increase in pedestrian traffic on the proposed property brings with it an increased chance of people looking into the garden of 16 Dallaway Gardens from over the fence. This is easy given the height of the fence only being 150cm. This actually occurred when a woman and child spotted a man looking over the fence in the summer of 2024.
- CCTV is not mentioned. With the proposed building being significantly taller building than 16 Dallaway Gardens there is a real concern for privacy. For example, a CCTV camera on the ground floor rear of the 96/98 London Road can already be seen from the kitchen of 16 Dallaway Gardens (and appears to point in the direction of said property) demonstrating the height difference between the 2 properties. The potential for CCTV to see into 16 Dallaway Gardens (both property and gardens) is a real concern.
- The rear windows on the proposed building will likely appear to be above the fence of 16 Dallaway Gardens (given the height of the slope) although this is unclear given the plans do not have measurements for this. The concern is that whilst the proposed glass would be obscured no mention is given to the windows being unopenable. This would again affect privacy.

Noise

- Under 'Industrial or Commercial Processes and Machinery' in the application no mention is made of air conditioning which the current commercial ancillary building on the property already has and can be heard almost 24/7. There is a very real concern that the new units will have air conditioning and that these units will significantly add to the nighttime noise in particular.

Environmental

- POLICY EG3: Neighbourhood Plan & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - The application states the reason for exemption from the BNG is that the 'development is subject to de minimis exemption (development below the threshold)'. The application then states the development is over 25 square metres. Government guidance states that be below the de minimis threshold the development needs to be below 25 square metres. This proposal does not therefore meet this criteria. The reason to justify this (That it is a commercial yard used by the commercial units fronting London Road) is at odds with the description in the application saying it is a vacant rear yard space and with the Design document stating that the area is 'currently made up of paving slabs, concrete or overgrown vegetation'. It is therefore not currently being used, thereby invalidating the reasoning for not complying with the BNG
- Light pollution – no mention is given to external lighting which would be seen from residential properties 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 & 20 Dallaway Gardens. Equally the light through the windows would not be obscured and would add to the overbearing nature of the development..
- It appears no consideration has been made to the provision for additional waste storage. The concern is that additional waste has nowhere to be properly kept prior to collection which has the potential to attract pests.
- No mention is given to the disturbance of bats. Bats are regularly seen flying above 16 and 17 Dallaway Gardens at dusk.

Other

- No mention of disability access

*Any approximations/scale given are based on the fence in the rear garden being a height of 150cm

For all the reasons stated above I would strongly urge the council to reject this planning.

Yours sincerely,

