


54 The Gatehouse, 354 Sea Front, Haverling
Island House PO11 0AT.

Your Ref. APP/19/00816.

September 17th 2019



Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter of August 29th
2019.

It is a surprise to me that a £1.3 million
renovation should require no more than a
planning application for a wall and an extension,
and that other changes to the exterior of the
building do not require such application.

My concerns, however, are less with these issues
than with the increase in road traffic and
parking requirements that the development of
the care home will generate, and the risk that it
will compromise the safety of residents, whether
in vehicles or on foot.

The care home originally compromised 22
bedrooms, three, for health and safety reasons was
restricted to ground floor use only.

For the last few years it has not been used as
a care home at all. While in the past, the
roadways

roadways, originally meant for the use of a private residence, were presumably adequate for their level of traffic volume and parking requirements, I doubt that they will now meet the additional supply, Service, emergency vehicle and visitor requirements of a 32-37 bed care home, i.e. 50% or so more inhabitants.

I suspect, that given the trend for people nowadays to continue driving later in life that originally there were fewer resident drivers than is now the case. Also, private and commercial vehicles have become bigger in size. Large services vehicles have difficulty now in manoeuvring around the site, and there has been recent damage to kerbs and borders.

Two private vehicles can only narrowly pass each other, in the entrance road, and manoeuvring is required when a larger vehicle is involved. The danger of increased traffic volume, and parking requirements was emphasised during the building works, when two minor collisions occurred.

/AS

2.

As to the two issues directly ^{involved} ~~mooted~~ -
i.e. wall, and single storey extension,
my comments are as follows:

Wall: As stated, its purpose is solely,
partially to conceal an iron fire escape. The
fire escape has been in place for many years
and is regarded now as a natural feature of
a charming, rambling old house. The new
wall seems to me to be far more obtrusive
than what it seeks to conceal, and far less
in keeping. I do not know whether or not
the fire escape is still in use. If not it
would make more sense to remove it than
cover it up. If the escape is in use then the
wall acts as a funnel, narrowing egress
from the area. This is aggravated by the flower
bed adjacent to it.

Extension. The main carpark is to the rear
of the building and the extension narrows
the distance from it. In the hopefully
~~unlikely~~ unlikely event of a major fire,
removal of the ~~residents~~ vehicles would, I,
/imagine

imagine, be highly desirable. This would need to be undertaken via a very narrow roadway, into which care home residents would need to be evacuated via two newly created fire exits. Apartment residents opposite would also be in this area, together with emergency vehicles and staff. A small additional risk obviously but the extension will hold electrical equipment.

Yours faithfully

Eric Jeram

ERIC JERRAM.