

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Beach [REDACTED]

Sent: 10 April 2019 10:54

To: Anita Gardner

Subject: A/31/19/PL.

Dear Mrs Gardner,

I am surprised the application is not being assessed pursuant to the granting of A/212/17/PL, which benefits from 2 Extant Plots (8 and 9) and which defines the Extent of Use and The First Schedule, and come under reserved matters. A/87/18/PL is one large plot and half of A/176/17/PL, both of which were refused by Arun, and A/176/17/PL was also dismissed at appeal. The lower part of A/87/18/PL is covered by A/212/17/CLP and A/212/17/CLP covers both A/31/19/PL and the remaining extant plot which is material in this matter.

A/31/19/PL proposes one large dwelling on Plot 9 which is a similar property to that on A/87/18/PL but on a smaller plot. A/87/18/PL was refused under policies D DM1, OSR DM1 and HD5.

There are no windows on the South aspect which infers forward planning for privacy when Plot 8 is developed. As the proposal virtually occupies all of Plot 9 then when Plot 8 is developed there will be a "wall" of property. The dwelling on Plot 9 itself is against policy with regard to affecting the character of the area but it and Plot 8 will be totally against the Inspector's description and vision of a verdant area with generous spacings between dwellings. The proposed dwelling is significantly higher than Ashurst (although the documentation states the contrary) and the other surrounding bungalows and will appear overwhelming, unharmonious and exceptional in its position.

Some dimensions need confirming. The edge of the plots at the road, as it is overgrown with encroached grass, and the gap between Ashurst and Plots 8/9. Ashurst was developed into part of Plot 7 and there was some 25 feet of width left of Plot 7. This important gap was recognised by the Inspector when dismissing the A/176/17/PL appeal and discussing the fallback of the A/212/17/CLP plots.

The Engineer (Drainage & Coastal) has commented on drainage and I would add that there is a road drain beside the proposed development and the associated soak away will be within the proposed site. They obviously will no doubt be protected in any development but the road at this point can flood and any development or increase in the land height as proposed could worsen drainage and flooding.

Regarding the dwelling itself, a number of Arun and Angmering policies are conflicted.

The proposed dwelling will be a large imposing property out of character with the area. The proposed dwelling is surrounded by bungalows or protected green space and not as stated in the application as being surrounded by substantial properties nor is it an area characterised by large 2 storey houses. Immediately to the South are two bungalows and four further South. To the East and opposite are eight bungalows. To the North there is protected green space and a high hedge hiding much of Badgers. To the West is protected green space. Notably the Inspector dismissed the A/176/17/PL appeal on the property affecting the character of the area.

The proposed dwelling sits much closer to the road than other properties and therefore has a greater impact. It also appears to be in front of the established build line. It should also be noted that the Inspector refers to properties being a comfortable distance from the road.

Policy References: D SP1. A thorough analysis and context appraisal would have clearly shown the locale being bungalows. The application does not reflect the characteristics of the site and local area in scale, character, materials and architecture.

D DM1. The application does not reflect or improve the character of the site and surrounding area and fails on character, appearance, attractiveness and impact.

HD 4. There is a contradiction in the documentation as to whether the first floor is timber/render or timber inserts. Neither however are harmonious with the surrounding properties.

HD 5. This development does not pay particular attention to integration, impacts on the landscape setting and does not follow the character of the existing build form or create a positive addition.

I am also aware of a number contradictions or anomalies in the Application, Design and Access Statement and CIL: The Planning History fails to mention A/176 and it's appeal and A/87 were refused; The Site is not bordered in the South by mature hedging but is rather a green gap, the West is green space, Ham Manor Way is not characterised by large detached 2 storey houses; Amount does not say how Plot 8 (garden) will be "fenced"; Scale does not show the ridge being above Ashurst (Ashurst also referred to as Ashcroft); Landscaping does not specify that the remainder of Plot 7 is left as green gap that the Inspector identified as material; Access has confusion over space for 6 or 12 cars; Sustainability has confusion over space allocated for working on some documents whereas on others it is all residential; the Emerging Local Plan emerged last year.

Conclusion. The surrounding properties are bungalows and the new dwelling will sit in the centre of the present green area as an out of character large blob on the landscape and dominate the area and neighbouring properties.

Regards, Brian Beach