

Amanda Scholes

From: Susan Leeson
Sent: 30 May 2013 08:04
To: Amanda Scholes
Subject: FW: Planning Application BR/41/13
Attachments: Planning Services.docx

From: Mike Wainwright [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2013 19:17
To: Susan Leeson
Cc: Planning
Subject: Planning Application BR/41/13

Dear Ms Leeson

Please find attached my letter of opposition to the above development.

Please also take this personal email address as proof of electronic signature for the letter

Kind regards

Michael Wainwright

19 Essex Road
Bognor Regis
PO21 2BU

Planning Services
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

From: Mr M Wainwright
19 Essex Road
Bognor Regis
PO21 2BU

29th May 2013

For the attention of Ms S Leeson

Dear Ms Leeson

With reference to the planning application BR/41/13:

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site with 6 two bedroom dwellings on land to the rear of 'Holmlea' Town Cross Avenue, Bognor Regis PO21 2DN

I strongly object to the above proposal for the following reasons:

The proposed development is very clearly overcrowded for the site and its narrow access drive. 6 two bedroom dwellings would be very likely to require 12 or more car parking spaces (not the 9 provided) not to mention work vehicles, deliveries and visitors, and the narrow entrance with cause problems for both existing local residents and residents of the new development. I live in Essex Road, but can rarely find a parking space in my road, so I depend on parking availability in Town Cross Avenue and regularly park outside or opposite the entrance to the site. If this proposal is granted this area will become even more congested like neighbouring roads to the detriment of everyone in the vicinity. Regularly even now cars are parked on both sides of the road allowing only 1 car to pass. The entrance to Essex Road is very dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians, and this entrance would cause another major risk of accidents as cars will not be able to see oncoming traffic as they turn into the road.

There will be an unacceptable loss of amenity to myself and my neighbours' enjoyment of our homes and gardens due to people and vehicle movements at all times of the day and night. The previous use of the site as an engineering workshop had defined working hours and there was no noise during the

evenings and weekends, which would be the times of most noise nuisance from the proposed development.

The layout of the proposed development is completely overbearing to my property and the others bordering the site from Essex Road. All front elevation windows of plots 2 and 3 would look directly into mine and my neighbours gardens. Furthermore, the proposal to remove the existing brick wall, which provides structural integrity for all the dividing walls between the properties in Essex Road, is in my view designed to allow the proposed properties an even better view into our gardens! Why else would a perfectly sound wall that is about 135 cm in height be replaced with a less permanent wooden fence of only 120 cm? This can only be proposed in order to make the oppressively overcrowded development *appear* less overcrowded! Can I ask who is going to maintain this fence after the properties are sold, and who would be liable if removal of the wall caused one of the adjoining walls to fall down in the future?

The proposers of this development and their supporters make much of the environmental benefits of modern lower energy consuming homes and the removal of asbestos from the site. However can I point out that squeezing 6 properties into this small space completely negates the energy consumption argument as each of these homes will be consuming gas and electricity for a much longer period than the previous use, and the overall effect will be a great increase in the carbon footprint of the site, especially as the engineering works has been closed for some time! As for the asbestos removal, there are strict laws in place that govern this and so *any* redevelopment, regardless of its merit, would have to incorporate removal of the asbestos.

The fact that there is a small engineering or business unit in a largely residential area is in my view entirely appropriate and to be welcomed by the community. There are a number of other business premises in the neighbourhood, and these provide much needed local employment. They have regular working hours, so do not cause a nuisance during evenings and weekends, so I see no reason why this change of use would benefit the area in any way.

Yours faithfully

M. F. Wainwright