

TREVOR E. UNSTED LTD

CHARTERED ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGIST

55-57 SEA LANE · RUSTINGTON
WEST SUSSEX · BN16 2RQ

10 April 2017

Attn: Mr S Davis Planning Department
Arun District Council
Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex BN17 5LF



Dear Mr Davis,

**Re: 2 Bedroom Bungalow on Land to East of Pumping Station,
Highcroft Close, Bognor Regis, West Sussex, PO22 8DS**

Your Ref: BR/80/17/PL

Following the withdrawal of BR/163/16/PL, I note that the applicant has now reapplied with the same proposal for development. Thus, I would yet again ask you to give consideration to the repeated observations and comments when considering this current application.

1. You assured me that the proposal satisfies your current room size criteria. However, by comparison with the existing dwellings on the estate, it is somewhat smaller.
2. The available garden area at approximately 65sqm is some 20% below your usual requirement and if the dwelling was enlarged to match the existing dwellings, the garden/amenity area would show an even larger shortfall.
3. The front boundary (north) is enclosed by a 500mm high wall. Whereas this is quite acceptable in front of the dwelling and certainly in accordance with existing front boundary treatment within the Close, I would suggest that the area to the east between the proposed dwelling and the boundary of N° 6, should be properly enclosed to provide reasonable privacy and containment for the benefit of the existing residents and the future occupants of the proposed dwelling. It is further suggested that a brick wall, say 1800-2000 high would be a suitable treatment in this location.
4. I note that you are again awaiting feedback or giving consideration to the Bio-diversity report, noise from the adjacent pumping station and the Flood Risk Assessment.

5. Having studied the application, I note that there are inaccuracies or omissions which should be addressed, albeit post validation.
- i. The site slopes down from north to south and this has not been indicated.
 - ii. Dimensions from the bungalow to the boundaries are not shown, in fact, no dimensions have been shown.
 - iii. No section and/or vertical heights are shown.
 - iv. Scale bars would have been helpful.
 - v. On drawing 5070/2 the roof pitches vary between 36° and 42° according to which elevation or roof slope is measured.

As previously stated, in my considered opinion the application site is really a verge designed initially as part of the road layout. For development potential, it is not viable and about as relevant as a traffic island. The application is opportunistic and proposes a development which is incompatible with and shoehorned into the existing built environment to the detriment of the residents. Thus, I would urge you to resist this application.

Yours sincerely,



Trevor E Unsted
(Executor to the Late Mrs M P Unsted's Estate)