

39 Hill Lane Barnham
Bognor Regis
West Sussex PO22 0BL

5th July 2018

To Arun District Council

Objection to;

Planning Application BN/23/1/PL for 37 Hill Lane Barnham PO22 0BL

The plans propose 3 additional houses on a rural lane, adjoining the conservation area of Church Lane, Barnham, outside of the settlement area. 3 new properties is an excessive development of the land from roughly 8/hectare to 200 and will completely change the nature of Hill Lane – one of the only remaining truly rural lanes in the Barnham Parish. Any previous developments/extensions on the lane have been from existing owner occupiers to create or improve their family home. The application is misleading and has inaccuracies – non-contextual drawings – unspecified ridge heights, plot area unclear, no marked site boundaries, power lines and transformer omitted.

1. The application on the grounds A1 Retail is to be converted to Residential
The suggestion that all of the existing buildings are/were A1 Retail (424m²) is incorrect.
“A1 Application (BN/53/04/CLE) for certificate of Lawfulness approved 07/01/2005 was existing retail buildings used for the sale of dried flowers, Products together with parking.”

The one previous retail unit (vacant) known as the Flower Barn, latterly Vagabonds, and closed for many months is a temporary wooden structure, that is significantly forward of the building line. Other units identified for demolition/ development include 2 x Water tanks and 2 x Shipping Containers, and the drying rooms clearly NEVER A1 Retail and were production facilities of a wholesale nursery.

Under ‘Like for like’ none of the existing buildings footprints can be developed above single story.

2. The proposed houses are behind the existing building line and have a higher ridge height than the existing buildings including the existing property No.37 resulting **significant loss of light and overlooking of the neighbouring homes and gardens**, as well as overlooking each other& 38.
Both 38 and 39 Hill Lane will be impacted **by loss of light** and privacy as the proposed dwellings run alongside the boundary with 38.
3. Whilst not a planning consideration, the plans omit the electric transformer unit (thought to be 11000Volts) and overhead cables that run through the proposed build area and are on the boundary between numbers 37 and 38 Hill Lane, what is to happen to this and access to it?
4. Drainage of site run off must be dealt with so as not to put any load on roadside ditches to conform with environmental drainage. The ditches are intended for containing run off from the Lane only and if any alteration to plot 37 is to go ahead waste water must be contained within.
5. Has it been established that the sewer can cope as it is the end of the pipe line?
6. Of the few dimensions given;
 1. The maintained access route for WSCC is marked as a diagonal and the tangential width does not meet the minimum 3.6m requirement, and on a bend will not allow a vehicle of any length through.

2. The garages appear to be at 0.8 m from the westerly perimeter boundary not the requisite 1m and the parking arrangement doesn't look practical for moving vehicles safely in and out.
7. There has clearly been no biodiversity assessment/impact as all the properties in the Lane benefit from a wide diversity of flora and fauna and including grass snakes, newts, slow worms, nesting and visiting birds, which should be maintained and considered in any development of this nature. There is a photo of a test pit within the application but no evidence that it was on this site. It could only have been dug in the back garden of 37 but no soil has been disturbed.
 8. It is disappointing that there are no planned environmental or sustainable proposals for energy or water or other.
 9. Inadequate refuse and recycling bin location. 4 bins are shown in collection point and every home has at least two and the bins are collected from the road side
 10. Will the same restrictions/codicils be applied to this application as other recent applications on Hill Lane
 - 43 and Church Farm Barns were required to demolish the existing property to meet the stipulation of one residential dwelling per plot;
 - Saxons have been required to have an agricultural tie to the additional residential dwelling on their plot

Previous applications have been rejected on the grounds that they are not in keeping with the nature and style of the lane and this clearly falls into this category

I am not NIMBY and have previously supported applications eg Saxons additional property .

One property in keeping with the existing properties and with the footprint and ridge height of the existing Flower Barn on the residential building line would be fully in keeping. Also, its my belief that no Hill Lane residents objected to the development at 43 Hill Lane.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Christopher Holmes