



c/o Grays Cottage,
Grays Close,
Haslemere.
GU27 2LJ,
1 August 2019.

Planning Department,
Waverley Borough Council,
The Burys,

GODALMING. BY EMAIL

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application 2019/1057

Loneside House, Haslemere.

The Haslemere Society recognises the parking difficulties for the occupants of the flats in Loneside House and the need to stop pedestrians having to step out into the busy and narrow Petworth Road due to parking on the footpath. We support the need to provide more and better parking but raise serious objections to the scheme which has been proposed for the following reasons:-

1) The proposal for a dropped kerb for the full length of the parking area and the consequent sloping of the footpath towards the highway is not acceptable. This produces a hazard especially in times of ice and snow to pedestrians, including the elderly and infirm with walking aids, and makes traversing this area with prams and trolleys/pushchairs and for the disabled particularly difficult. An almost horizontal footpath surface is required which would be more easily provided by using a slightly higher half battered kerb and a reduction in the level of the parking area which will increase the retaining wall height.



2) There are no details of the transition from the car park to the different level of the driveway to Petworth Court. Drainage of the parking area is not addressed and should be.

3) A 2m high vertical retaining wall of railway sleepers will on its own not be structurally adequate. There is no submission of any soil investigations to determine the structural design parameters and feasibility for the retaining wall or information on any ground water conditions that might have to be dealt with. It is likely that a different safe structural solution will be required.

Aesthetic Considerations.

4) A retaining wall face of 'railway sleepers' is aesthetically totally out of character and unacceptable in this area generally and particularly just outside the Conservation Area. It does not sit well against the Loneside House and other period buildings and it does not accord with 'good design principles'.

The claim in the Design and Access Statement that it 'respects the character of surrounding developments, is a modest change ensuring that it would not appear stark or odd with the surrounding development' is totally misleading and could not be further from the truth.

The Haslemere Design Statement requirements are not fulfilled and no attempt has been made to reproduce the natural appearance of the existing embankment. A battered (backward sloping) wall with planting incorporated would be a better solution possibly using a stone facing or stone filled timber gabions.

A 1m high wire fence on top of the wall is again out of character with the area and needs to be replaced by a more natural material as a safety barrier. A hedge will be difficult to maintain unless it is set back from the retaining wall.

5) The surface of the car parking area appears to be an ordinary concrete finish but this is unclear. Such a bland surface fronting on to this period building is aesthetically unacceptable and should be revised to for example cobbles.



6) The elevation of the bin storage area will be unsightly unless measures are taken to adequately conceal the bins. The height of solid fencing needs increasing to mask overfilled bins. The retaining wall below this area should be treated in the same way as the main retaining wall for consistency. Consideration should be given to the possibility that bins might only be collected and left at footpath level.

7) The proposals require the removal of a safety mirror located to assist the safe egress from the house opposite. A means of incorporating this in the scheme should be considered. Adequate highway sight splays are mentioned but for vehicles parked in an easterly facing direction these are inadequate and SCC's views on this and the scheme generally need to be confirmed.

Given the poor design which has been proposed The Haslemere Society strongly objects to this application (but not in principle) and considers that a refusal of the application and a redesign are necessary.

Yours faithfully,

John Greer (Vice Chairman, The Haslemere Society)