

From: Julie Grieves on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 02 April 2019 09:28
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application BR/49/19/OUT

Julie Grieves - (Working days Monday, Tuesday, Thursday & Friday 9.15am-2.15pm)
| Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 01 April 2019 09:59
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning Application BR/49/19/OUT

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk  Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Jill Dickin Schinas
Sent: 31 March 2019 15:02
To: Simon Davis
Subject: Planning Application BR/49/19/OUT

Dear Mr Davis,

We wish to register our objection to the proposed development of 26 Burnham Avenue, PO21 2JU (BR/49/19/OUT)

This e-mail provides a full version of our objection, the comments box on the related website only allowing for a third of the number of characters.

1) **Intrusive**

The planned development is completely out of character with the local neighbourhood, which consists largely of semi-detached houses dating from the first two decades of the 20th century. The proposed development is inappropriate both visually and socially.

The proposed buildings are large and obtrusive; they will dominate the entire street. At the back, they will overlook hitherto secluded properties in Burnham Gardens, creating an invasion of privacy. Likewise, the

four upper flats at the front of the two buildings will look across into the bedrooms of houses on the opposite side of Burnham Avenue.

2) Inappropriately intensive

The development will create a community-within-a-community.

In recent years, two properties at the west end of the street have been demolished to make way for flats, and another larger development has been erected towards the eastern end of the road, in the junction with Sturges Road. (The latter is a site which was originally cleared, during the war, by a bomb.) One other house, sandwiched between the flats and the site of proposed development, is visually unchanged but has been converted into a care centre accommodating 19 bedrooms.

These new flats should not be taken as setting a precedent for further development. The intrusion of clumps of one and two bedroom accommodation amongst the Edwardian homes should be lauded as an example of the way in which islands of 'affordable housing', student or single person accommodation, and care facilities can be inserted in an existing estate - but if the balance is tipped too far and those 'islands' predominate, then the entire character of the area will change.

This change will not only be visual but also social. Last summer we were witness to a violent altercation between men living in one of these multi-bedroom flats, versus residents from elsewhere in the road; and we have been told that this is not the only street-fight to have occurred.

The placement of a community of 22 flats alongside a house already divided into 16 one-bedroom units could easily exacerbate this problem.

Burnham Avenue has already accommodated its full quota of care facilities and flats, and this fact should be acknowledged.

3) Parking

The proposed development will vastly aggravate existing parking problems.

The aforementioned recent constructions at either end of the street both incorporate parking areas. The proposal for 26 Burnham Avenue does not contain any such facility. Indeed, the plans show the new buildings occupying the entire plot and the notices include the observation that there is "no parking or vehicle access proposed to the site". The implication is that 22 new households would be attempting to park in the street outside the new flats – and, to be frank, there are seldom two free parking spaces available here, never mind 22!

Besides providing parking for local residents, Burnham Avenue and the adjacent roads are also sometimes used by people living in Ockley Rd and are also frequently used by shoppers, tourists, church-goers, and commuters. On busy week-days and sunny Saturdays in the summer we often have to park 50m from our house, and we have sometimes had to park as much as 100m away.

Ideally, we would hope that the community as a whole will abandon the use of private vehicles and move towards the use of public transport - this would, indeed, be the 'green' option- but before this can happen the local public transport services will need to be improved and made more affordable, perhaps with a government subsidy. To approve a housing development which depends upon the implementation of these measures at some future, unspecified date would be very rash.

It should be noted that 22 is, in fact, a conservative estimate for the number of parking spaces which the planned development would need. Although some of the new home-owners may be car-less, others will have more than one vehicle. For example, we currently have two, our neighbours on either side have two each, and the applicant and his wife appear to have four vehicles between them. Therefore it could be expected that these 22 homes might generate the need for some 30 to 35 parking spaces, not taking into account the vehicles belonging to visitors and tradesmen.

Burnham Avenue used to be a quiet backstreet but is now used by traffic taking a short-cut between Victoria Drive and the town centre, with cars often zooming through at well above the speed limit. Parking

congestion increases the danger, both to road users and pedestrians – but, as already noted, increased congestion is, in fact, virtually impossible! The fact is that there would simply be no place whatsoever for the 22 new home-owners to park their cars.

4) Property values

The development will lead to a reduction in the value of the surrounding houses.

The applicant spent his childhood in the house adjacent to 26 Burnham Avenue, and, until very recently, his mother, Janet Cole, was still the owner of that house. In recent years, Janet turned her house into a nursing home (<http://www.housingcare.org/housing-care/facility-info-136702-brecklands-nursing-home-bognor-regis-england.aspx>), and she subsequently rented the house to a business which provides accommodation for young, vulnerable refugees. (See planning application BR/37/17/PL). We understand that the house has now been sold to this business.

Roughly four years ago, an application was made to demolish 26 Burnham Avenue for the purposes of building some eight or nine flats. The people most vociferous in their objection to this plan were Janet Cole and her son, Christian - ie. the current applicant! Christian subsequently bought the house, with the approval and support of other local residents, and he told us that he had done so specifically to prevent the planned development. We can recall him telling us that the destruction of the old house would be “criminal”, and he also referred to the fact that the creation of the flats would lower the value of adjacent properties, including his mother's house. Thus, it is rather ironic that he should now be seeking permission for a development which is roughly twice as intensive as the previous plan and which can therefore be expected to have an even more negative effect on the value of adjacent properties.

5) Drainage

One question whether adequate thought has been given to the matter of sewage and grey-water disposal for such a large complex.

In the winter, and particularly after a heavy rainfall, our drains sometimes back up and overflow. We have been told that this is due to the increased load, in such circumstances, on the municipal drain under the road. 26 Burnham Avenue currently has a large garden, and it is to be noted that covering it with concrete, in the form of buildings, will aggravate the problem of water run-off (the rain which would have been absorbed into the ground being forced, instead, to flow into the road).

6) Preservation of an historic building

The planned development involves the destruction of a building which is reckoned to be the finest in the street by far, and which is amongst the most attractive in this entire estate.

26 Burnham Avenue was built in about 1910 and is a period piece and a classic example of the best of Edwardian suburban architecture. Its loss would not only affect residents in the immediate vicinity. The building is of value to the entire community, being an example of the sort of construction encouraged by Hotham. A great deal of money has been spent, in the past few years, on renovating and refurbishing the property, and it would be a tragedy if all this effort and expense were to be for naught.

We should like to point out that the garden associated with 26 Burnham Avenue is very large, and adjacent to the house and fronting the street there is an area of land which is easily big enough for the construction of another detached house. The applicant would find better favour with his neighbours and with other local residents if he were to present plans for a building suitable for this site. Such a proposal, rather than harming the local area, might even enhance it. Meanwhile, the existing house, being large, could be divided internally into two.

In conclusion, it is clear that the proposed development would create an unacceptable level of impact on residential amenities on several fronts.

Before closing, we should like to point out that this planning proposal has not been properly advertised. There is no statutory notice displayed outside the building, and we - who live opposite - knew nothing whatsoever about the proposal until two days ago, when another resident told us. Our neighbour, although he is well acquainted with the applicant, also knew nothing about the proposal. The secrecy surrounding the application is most unfortunate and is not acceptable.

The local government website tells us that the council must advertise a planning proposal:
"The Council will publicise this application by means of a site notice on or near the application site and on our website. The notice needs to be displayed until the date indicated on it for comments to be made by and for not less than 21 days."
Since this condition has not been met, it would seem that the current application is currently invalid.

Yours sincerely,
Nick and Jill Schinas; Caesar Schinas; Roxanne Schinas
(4th and 5th generation of our family to be resident at 35 Burnham Avenue)