

From: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 December 2020 13:05
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Objection to 70a Tarrant St Planning Application Ref: AB/118/20/PL

Neighbour Objection

Andrew Wood MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department

T: 01903 737768
E: andrew.wood@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Gary Pearce [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 December 2020 09:55
To: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to 70a Tarrant St Planning Application Ref: AB/118/20/PL

From Gary & Keely Pearce - 101 Tarrant Street, Arundel BN18 9DN

To Mr Andrew Wood

Planning Application Ref: AB/118/20/PL
70a Tarrant street.

Re. The planning Application to develop the existing garage into a 3 storey building with 2 self contained flats.

Dear Mr Wood,

We live in number 101 directly opposite the site of the garage/proposed development and strongly object to it on the following grounds:

OUTLOOK, OVERSHADOWING AND LOSS OF LIGHT TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES

The planned property severely degrades the outlook of neighbouring properties and overshadows the immediate neighbours' houses and outdoor areas leading to significant loss of light. The immediate neighbours in 64 and 70 Tarrant Street are particularly affected and their lives and amenity of their homes degraded.

LOSS OF VISUAL AMENITY AND DEGRADATION OF THE CHARACTER OF THE HISTORIC STREET SCENE

The proposed development is surrounded by Grade II listed properties within the Arundel conservation zone opposed by a lovely terrace of Georgian cottages. The current building, while of no particular historic value itself, does not detract from the surrounding buildings being low rise, set back from the road and sympathetically designed with half tiles and slate. It creates important air space, and a window for visitors and residents to view and appreciate the construction of the adjacent listed buildings thus adding to the feel and historic interest of this part of the road.

The Proposer's own DAS and Heritage Statement prepared by Ian Wightman quotes the Arun District Council "Supplementary Planning Guidance" for Conservation Areas which includes a "Statement of Character" for Arundel Conservation Area stating – "The Council thus aims to - Require that new buildings must acknowledge the character of their special environment in the layout, form, scale, detailing and use of materials." We hold that the use of Juliet balconies and 3-story 'end on' profile is not a sensitive acknowledgement of the special and historic character of the surrounding buildings but will stand out abruptly and unsympathetically and will detract from the historic street scene and result in a loss of visual amenity, and degradation of the overall characterful nature of this end of Tarrant Street.

EXCESSIVE PARKING OVER-PRESSURE AND INCREASE IN TRAFFIC

Parking in Arundel is well known to be extremely difficult – and particularly so in Tarrant Street. This specific area is already completely oversubscribed. This is due partly to the fact that there is no parking on the side of the road where the development is proposed. The garage at 70a is already a vector for multiple vehicles, it would be difficult to imagine how a further two dwellings on the site, adding their own vehicles, could be envisaged as sustainable, environmentally considerate, safer or reasonable from such a small footprint.

In the planning application document it lists the garage structure to facilitate parking for 4 cars however this is currently used as private garaging for the owner/developer in Maltravers street. The proposed design suggests the garaging and flats to be entirely separate units and there is nothing to indicate that the garage would not continue to be kept for use as a private garage for Maltravers Street with the new properties adding vehicles to the street. Any assumption that whoever was to purchase or reside in the 2 proposed dwellings would not have cars is unrealistic in a town with limited employment opportunities bearing in mind the demographic of those most likely to select residences accessed by one or more stair cases.

How much vehicular activity is it appropriate, or reasonable to propose for one site to generate? Especially in an area that is meant to be protected. This is overdevelopment of a small site.

In addition such an excessive increase in the parking pressure in the immediate area and will likely lead to more instances of illegal parking on the double yellow lines on the corner of Tarrant Street and Surrey Wharf both blocking access to the dropped pavement for the walking impaired and those with children's buggies and causing a safety hazard for cars exiting Surrey Wharf and oncoming traffic.

NOISE AND DISTURBANCE

We are concerned that the proposal of employing glass doors and Juliette balconies at the front of the building will result in noise disturbance particularly as these will likely front living rooms at both levels. The close proximity of terraces of buildings and the narrowness of Tarrant Street at this point mean that acoustics are channelled and amplified. In milder weather and throughout the summer these doors would inevitably be open and sounds/noise that would normally be restricted to the household (music, tv, loud conversation), will be regularly emanating from the 2 proposed flats directly towards the bedrooms on the first and second stories of the opposite properties causing a nuisance and disturbance.

Yours sincerely

Gary and Keely Pearce
101 Tarrant Street