

November '23 agenda – Planning Applications

Braemar

JR BOYLE <jeffboyle@btinternet.com>

4 Nov 2023,
14:21 (2
days ago)

Hi Paulette,

As we will be unable to attend the November 16 PC meeting in person, could you please add our objections to proposed housing at Braemar (RR/2023/2184/P to the agenda. Many thanks

Our garden abuts the site for the proposed 2 x 4 bedroom houses. We also own one of the garages on the existing drive as shown on the block plan.

We object to this proposal on the following grounds.

1: The existing drive between Braemar and Mafeking is extremely narrow and will only allow single file traffic. Over the years there have been numerous occasions when turning on to the drive from the A265 we have been forced to back on to the increasingly busy main road until a vehicle/s halfway down the drive has passed. This is dangerous, and must be taken into consideration, as introducing more vehicles from the proposed houses will only exacerbate the situation.

2: HGVs and emergency vehicles, such as fire appliances, would find great difficulty in reaching the proposed houses through this narrow point.

3: The passing point as shown on the block plan is for the sole benefit of the proposed houses. It in no way takes into consideration the dangers that increased traffic would pose to the garage owners. There is there no provision for a passing point at the bottom of the drive where it meets the A265.

4: As we understand it, any new access to proposed new housing must include at least one footway, or at least room for pedestrian access, for safety's sake The block plan indicates neither.

5: At present the six garage owners have a 'gentleman's agreement' as to giving way to each other regarding entering and exiting their garages, each of which has its own dedicated turning space. We feel that if this proposal is accepted the situation will change, and the increased traffic could cause vehicle accidents or even personal injury.

6: Heavy plant, lorries and workmen's vehicles travelling to and from the site could block the existing drive and garages, and will most certainly leave it covered in mud, which will prove hazardous, as well as inconvenient, for the garage owners.

7: The existing drive would need to be excavated for the installation of utilities This would mean garage holders being effectively evicted from their garages for as long as any work/s take place. We certainly do not expect to, and will not, be forced out of our own garage to park on the main road.

8: An electric gate to the proposed houses is indicated on the block plan. Several gated estates and developments have been proposed in Etchingham over the years, but they have been rejected on the advice of the emergency services.

9: Both proposed houses, which are much higher than properties in front, show hard terracing/paving to the rear and one side on the block plan. This, added to the introduction of two large houses and car parking facilities on what was a tree-covered site, which during heavy rainfall used to act as a natural soakaway, could well flood the gardens, garages and houses immediately in front of the proposed site.

10: The extra water run-off could also possibly adversely affect the Northern end of our garden.

11: The Application Form, in answer to the question 'Will this proposal increase the flood risk elsewhere?' claims it will not. For the reasons in Point 9 we have demonstrated that this should read 'Yes'.

12: The Application Form also states that the proposed houses will not be seen from the road. Because of the steep land rise from the A265 to the tree line at the rear of the proposed site the answer to this should also be 'Yes.'

13: The bin collection area as shown on the block plan is flawed. It shows only two bins rather than four (brown and black fortnightly) and obstructs the entrance to Braemar's garden.

14: We doubt that Rother's bin operatives will collect them from where they are shown, which means they will be left at the bottom of the drive which will block vehicles from entering or exiting, and/or pose a hazard for pedestrians - especially parents and children - using the footway.

15: The side top window of House 2 as shown overlooks our garden, thus depriving us of our privacy.

16: If this impractical proposal is accepted we will insist on strong, 6ft high feather edge fencing between the proposed houses and our garden for our security.

For the record, considering we have a garage on the existing drive, we have not been approached by anyone regarding this proposal. We would have thought that any developer/builder would have done their homework and contacted us.

Kind regards,

Jeff and Anne Boyle