





‘Garden land and infilling developments should only be permitted when they do not have a detrimental impact on the existing character of the area or local biodiversity’. **The proposed multi level massive development replacing two detached residencies and infilling their gardens is particularly detrimental to the character of the area occupied by many smaller residences.**

‘Care must be taken to ensure that any new development sits well in the street scene and the form of any new development must be appropriate for the site in which it sits’. **Replacing two detached residences with spaces to each side with a much higher and massive frontage stretching up to the two extreme boundaries and removing enclosing hedges does not sit well in this street scene.**

‘The impact of the new development should be carefully considered to avoid undue pressure on the existing infrastructure’. **Medical and social facilities in the town are currently in very high demand and the creation of 23 sheltered houses for elderly/mature people will only exacerbate this.**

‘New development should provide for safe movements of vehicles and pedestrians’. **This scheme is located on the busy eastern gateway to the town without a footpath on the north side of the highway necessitating every pedestrian movement to and from the development crossing this busy road. Furthermore in order to maximise floor space lifts are proposed to take cars to and from the below ground car park introducing operational difficulties for the elderly which would not be present if space was allocated for a side access driveway.**

Town and Conservation Area – ‘Preserve and enhance the character of the town centre conservation area by ensuring that the scale, design and proportions of new buildings responds to and respects the existing historic features. Space around development is of as much significance as its architecture’. **The footprint of this proposal is vastly larger than the existing buildings in the adjacent conservation area. It does not enhance the conservation area. There is so little space at the west and east boundaries and a high proportion of the site is covered in new building structure such that the latter requirement is not met.**



### **Non Compliance with Waverley Borough Local Plan**

Our assessment suggests that the application does not comply with the following policies of the Waverley Borough Local Plan :-

D1(b) harm to character and scale.

D4 (a), (c), (h) Scale, form, height, overbearing, pedestrian access.

BE6 (a), (b), (d) No greater mass, detrimental infilling, space at boundaries

TC3(a), appropriate scale, environment enhancement.

### **Other Observations**

Similar to the defined low density housing area of Weydown and Derby Roads this residential area on the town's eastern approach Petworth Road is a low density residential area which contributes to the attractive character of the town. The removal of two houses and the imposition of this significantly higher and relatively massive structure four storeys high in parts with little space at each side is totally out of character with the area.

Foul Drainage – Due to the topography of the site all foul drainage flows to a collection chamber and pumping station towards the north end of the site, to be pumped up to the public sewer in Petworth Road. No vehicular access is provided to the pumping station which requires regular maintenance –( and no firefighting access to the rear areas of the proposed development !)

Rainwater Drainage – From calculations submitted the scheme increases the impermeable roof area by 85%. There are other 'hard' areas notwithstanding the SUDS areas requiring the collection of rainwater to a large 25.6m x 5.6m x 1.9m soakaway chamber at the lowest part of the site. It is stated that 'overland/surface exceedance flows due to extreme events would naturally flow downhill to the wooded area to the NW of the site. It is unclear whether this is outside the demise of this site. The sizing of the soakaway chamber is based upon assumed percolation properties of the underlying soil as soil investigations have not been carried out in this area. It is understood that the rainwater disposal area is a low lying generally wet area and the rainwater disposal aspects need further attention.

The location and block plan encloses a considerably greater area to the north of the site than all other submitted plans. It should be clarified whether the location and block plan is correct as this might provide scope for future development to the north of the site.



The transport statement suggests that the existing two houses would generate 2 two way movements in peak hour periods but the development with 23 apartments would only generate 4 such movements. **This does not seem logical.** There is no discussion relating to the increase in total traffic (as opposed to peak hour) due to this development. Also the dates of the existing traffic counts appear to coincide with half term school holidays and cannot therefore be relied upon. The increase in traffic, which will be generated during the Polo season by activities recently approved at the nearby Barfold Farm (Cortium Sports), has not been considered.

We refer to Appeal Refusal no. APP/R3650/A/11/2161833 for planning application 2011/0919 – 48 Petworth Road for a single house construction whereas this current application is for a relatively massive construction of 23 residential units. Many of the Appeal Inspector's comments/reasons for refusal are particularly relevant to this application, most notably :-

-Item 5 – ‘harm to the visual character and distinctiveness of the locality, overlooking and loss of light’.

- Item 6 – ‘the use of domestic garden land and promoting and need for reinforcing local distinctiveness’.

- Items 8 & 10 – ‘visual harm through loss of vegetation and impact on verdant or semi rural character’.

Also Item 13 on sightlines indicates the Inspector's concerns about access to the site from Petworth Road and the potential accident consequences. These are far greater with this current application.

The drawing of the visibility splay in appendix 5 of the Traffic Statement appears to be incorrect in that the very large oak or chestnut tree located between the two existing houses is closer to the road than shown on the drawing which will reduce the available vision splay. Vision obstructions caused by vegetation to the front of properties nos. 36 and 42 create further significant restrictions. Given that the exit from the car lift out of the basement car park lies opposite the ‘in’ gateway it is likely that elderly motorists will be tempted to use this gateway to exit the site where ‘nosing out’ is very hazardous due to the very restricted vision.

Similarly pedestrians and elderly people using mobility scooters will want to cross the road at the nearest point to the town, which is most dangerous due to the vision restrictions on the north side, which would also affect a pedestrian crossing if one was to be provided but this is not referred to in the application.



From our reading of the submitted Traffic Statement we feel that it has been prepared to minimise the distinct difficulties and dangers of road traffic accidents that this proposed development has the potential to create without putting forward any positive steps to overcome these.

The provision of 27 car parking spaces for 23 apartments leaves only 4 spaces for employees, visitors and service vehicles which is not adequate. There will be a reluctance by elderly residents to use the car lift into the basement car park, especially for regular use, resulting in residents parking and blocking the forecourt area. The car lift means of accessing the car park is less appropriate for sheltered housing than creating a roadway access down one side of the development.

A statement of floor areas appears not to have been given in the application but our approximate assessment is that excluding external terraces some 3200 sq. m of new construction is proposed – **more than six times the existing accommodation on the site and clearly an unacceptably large development in this low density residential area. This will adversely affect the attractive character of the area adjacent the town centre.**

Reference is made in the application to external lighting as part of the security system. The introduction of such lighting into an otherwise unlit residential area (away from the highway) will need special consideration to prevent the night time light pollution having an adverse effect on the amenity of neighbours.

The application refers to the proposed development as sheltered apartments for people over 60 and any approval that WBC may consider should make this a condition for all new and subsequent owners. However there is no guarantee that the apartments will not be bought initially or subsequently by people from London and elsewhere outside Haslemere thus preventing local people from downsizing and releasing their larger properties. (ie adding to the elderly population of the town).

The Haslemere Society is also concerned at the cumulative demands on the local social and medical facilities in Haslemere resulting from Renaissance's development ambitions at Hindhead, the many other existing care homes and sheltered housing developments in the town and the additional demands this development will create.

Yours faithfully,

John Greer ( Vice Chairman, The Haslemere Society)

