

8 Canada Rd
Arundel
BN18 9HY

5th November 2014

Mr D Sullivan
Arun District Council
Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Dear Mr Sullivan,

RE: Planning Application AB/115/14/OUT

I am writing to object to the outline application for 2 semi-detached houses to be built in the front gardens of 12 and 14 Canada Road, Arundel. I am an immediate neighbour and I am very concerned that the proposed development will have an unacceptable adverse impact for owners of the adjoining properties.

My objections are:

1. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (ii) demonstrates that it responds positively to the identified characteristics and resources of the site and the area to create attractive places and spaces with the needs of people in mind and respects and enhances local distinctiveness;

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (iv) does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers, land, uses or property and, where relevant, facilitates the development of adjoining sites;

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (v) takes account of any unacceptable adverse impacts that may arise from adjoining land uses or property;

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (viii) provides for vehicle parking in accordance with Policy GEN12 and Appendix 2 and open space in accordance with Policy GEN20.

I believe that the proposed houses do not comply with these policies. Due to the unique layout of this part of Canada Road, the proposed houses will have a significant impact for the surrounding neighbours and their enjoyment of their properties, particularly in terms of:

Overlooking windows (even with the measures to reduce this that are listed in the application), loss of open plan leading to an increased sense of enclosure due to the size, orientation and position of the proposed development in relation to existing properties, loss of light and vehicle parking issues.

The properties 10 to 16 Canada Road are characterised by long, open plan front gardens sweeping down to the footpath. Properties 2 to 8 face onto these front gardens. The proposed development would destroy the open plan and leave the existing properties facing back gardens, being able to see into the new houses rear or side windows and gardens and would result in an unduly cramped form of development which would not be in keeping with the character and amenities of the surrounding area.

On the plan, the proposed houses appear larger, particularly the width, than the existing houses and this design would be out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

2. Non-compliance with Government/Arundel guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 - 53. Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.

Arundel Neighbourhood Plan 2014 - 2029 The Neighbourhood Plan allocates the following sites for housing development, as shown on the Proposals Map: i. Land at River Road to be delivered in the period 2014-2019; ii. The Former Castle Stables, Arundel Castle, to be delivered in the period 2014-19; iii. The Old Gasworks in Ford Road to be delivered 2020-29;

The proposed development is not within the three sites listed in the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan as suitable for housing development.

The applicants Design and Access/Planning Statement seems to imply that the proposed development will meet the requirement to make more efficient use of urban land and thus relieving pressure on Greenfield sites. It is difficult to see how the proposed development meets this requirement as it is in residential front gardens and will cause harm to the local area for the reasons outlined under point 1.

3. Slope of the Land

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (iv) does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers, land, uses or property and, where relevant, facilitates the development of adjoining sites;

The Design and Access/Planning Statement states that the proposed development will "utilise the slope of the site, sloping down towards Canada Road, so as not to create an oppressive feature to the neighbouring properties".

I believe this statement fails to take into account that neighbouring properties No 2 and No 4 actually sit lower than the proposed development and they will therefore not benefit from utilising the slope of the site and will be overbearing for these properties.

The angle of the slope does not appear to offer enough reduction in height to reduce the impact of the proposed development and the new houses and the existing properties 6 to 16 will still overlook each other.

4. Inadequate parking and access

POLICY GEN12 - The Local Planning Authority will base its consideration of the need for on-site parking provision on its parking standards contained within this Plan.

Single House & Estate Development: For each dwelling of 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms and providing that dwelling does not exceed 120 sq. metres gross floor area (excluding integral garage):- 1 GARAGE OR CAR SPACE and 1 SPACE FOR VISITORS to be provided in curtilage where possible and, in any case, be in a convenient position which will encourage use.

In considering the extent of reduced on-site parking provision, the Council will have regard to environmental and highway safety issues, together with the following factors: - (i) the availability, type and proximity of public parking; (ii) The availability of alternative means of transport;

According to the parking guidelines set out in GEN 12, a three bedroom house of the size proposed in the application is required to have parking space for a minimum of 2 cars where possible and this proposed development does not provide sufficient parking space to meet these requirements.

The applicant argues that the proposed development does not require a provision of 4 parking spaces as there is sufficient off road parking but I believe that this argument is seriously flawed.

I note that the statement uses the standard 2.4m x 4.8m bay dimensions to calculate the theoretic number of parking spaces. As there are no marked parking bays, in practice, the actual number of available "spaces" is far less. Also the applicant only provides parking data for two periods in the summer holidays which is not representative. There is already intense on-street parking pressure on the section of Canada Road mentioned in the application, especially after 17.30 and at weekends. Residents also resist parking alongside number 2 as this area is dark and secluded at night and vandalism of residents' vehicles has become an increasing problem over the past few years

The off road area the applicant is referring is no better as it is not permanent.

The area to the left (looking towards the park from the proposed development) is part of the local park. The housing department at Arun District Council have confirmed that the fences currently in place are to be moved to the roadside as this area was never intended to be and should not currently or in the future be used for residential parking.

The area to the right (looking towards the park from the proposed development) is also part of the local park and not to be used for residential parking as detailed above.

In the parking survey it was stated there would be a total of 29 parking spaces for residents but as the off-road parking is to be taken away we are now to be reduced to a total of 16 on road parking spaces. With the proposed development this would put intolerable pressure on already intense competition for parking. There could also be highway safety issues for residents as the road is frequently used as a 'rat run' from the A27 queues, so the reduction of passing places (exacerbated by the proposed dwellings vehicles) will make crossing the road to the park opposite hazardous, especially for the high number of children in the local area

In a community survey undertaken in November 2012, the most commonly identified means for getting around outside of the town were by car (89%), the bus (24%) and walking (22%). It is therefore highly likely that anyone moving into these properties will require their own transport in-order to commute to work/school/college. Currently 4 properties surrounding the proposed development have 2 or more cars per household.

5. Ground stability

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 – 121. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation;

I have serious concerns about the impact the proposed works could have on the stability of the neighbouring properties. The land slopes down towards Canada Road and there are no retaining walls. Subsidence is already a concern in the area due to natural springs. There has been subsidence at the top of Canada Road resulting in the need to underpin a number of houses.

6. Public rights of way and access.

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 – 75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.

The paths in the centre and to both sides of the proposed development are not listed as Public Right of Way on the Definitive Plan at Chichester County Hall, however there is uncertainty as to what access rights the residents have.

When I requested disabled access for my property, there was some confusion by the Councils as to who owns the paths. If the path in the centre is owned jointly by the residents of 12 and 14, then it would follow that the alternative paths they intend to use when the path is removed would belong to other properties and they would not have an automatic right of access to enter their property via the other paths.

I am concerned that the proposed development removes the centre path and makes no provision for access to number 12 and 14 should the residents of number 10 and 16 block the path between the respective houses. This could lead to unwelcomed disputes in the future unless access rights are firmly established as part of this application.

7. Wildlife

Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

The application states that the proposed development is laid to lawn. This is not correct as 50% of the site (the front garden of number 12) is heavily planted and includes an established tree. The garden is poorly maintained and is highly likely to contain wildlife. Slow worms are common in this area and are included in Schedule 5 of the Act. There have been slow worms sited in our garden and in the garden of 16 Canada Road. This is not addressed in the Biodiversity Checklist submitted by the applicant and I see no evidence that any assessment has been made in order to determine whether such wildlife will be affected by this development. There are also established trees in the front garden of number 16 which would be very close to the proposed dwellings and could therefore affect the structural integrity of the new houses with root growth etc.

In conclusion, I do not believe this pre planning application meets local or national planning policies and should therefore be rejected. I would be grateful if you would take my objections into consideration when deciding this application. My neighbours and I would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our homes to illustrate our objections at first hand.

Yours sincerely



Mrs Amanda McNeill