

9th March 2017.

 Planning Department,

 Waverley borough Council,

 The Burys,

 Godalming. BY EMAIL.

Dear Sirs,

18 Critchmere Hill, Haslemere.

2017/0207

The size and scale of these proposals are more acceptable than previous applications and The Haslemere Society therefore does not object in principle to this application but would suggest strongly that the following matters are satisfactorily addressed BEFORE an approval is considered/granted (to avoid subsequent minimal cost proposals).

1) WBC Planning PolicyD4 (which is quoted in the design statement) states – ‘’the Council will seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design…’’ The Haslemere Design Statement has a similar requirement.

The application does not specify any materials – bricks, windows, eaves and gutter details, roof tiles, car park surfacing, fencing, etc. Without this information being submitted and approved the Council cannot fulfil its obligations under this policy when granting an approval. Such information needs to be submitted and considered as part of the approval process.

1



2) No dimensions are given of the plan size or heights of the dwellings. These need to be stated. A dimension of only 2.3m is given between the proposed new dwelling and the retained property at no.18 which will result in a very narrow and long side passage to both houses. An increase in the space between the two properties would enhance the appearance from the road and be more practical, particularly as there is a change in level of at least 1.5m requiring a retaining wall – or even underpinning of the existing house flank wall.

3) A dimension indicating the set back of the proposed dwellings from the road is not given. It scales 5m which provides no or inadequate pedestrian space between the house, public footpath and a car. Also the difference in level of over a metre between the road and the dwelling will result in a significant gradient towards the house in the upper parking bay. A relocation further away from the road (there is plenty of space in the rear garden) would give a better solution and enhance the street scene.

This is an important aspect of the required ‘’high quality design’’.

4) It is assumed that the applicant is also the owner of the existing dwelling at no. 18, part of which is proposed to be demolished to facilitate the proposed new construction. Concomitant with this should be an application to form a dropped kerb and vehicular access to no.18 to avoid parking on the narrow Critchmere Hill. This also needs to be addressed.

Given satisfactory resolutions of the above points The Haslemere Society would not object to this scheme being approved. The Society also welcomes the proposal to retain and not demolish no. 18 as this building has some characteristic details of the Haslemere early 20th century vernacular which we hope the developer will be minded to repair.

Yours faithfully,

 John Greer (Vice Chairman, The Haslemere Society)
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