

Arundel District Council,
Planning Department,
Arundel Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
West Sussex,
BN17 5LF

17 0 MAY 2022

10th May 2022

Re: Planning Application BR/82/22 PL
To the rear of "Holmlea",
Town Cross Avenue, Bognor Regis, PO21 2DN

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

Whilst I agree that residential use of this very awkward site is better than commercial use, I think that the proposed ten apartments is an absurd over-development, which is very common when land-owners and architects get together to wring as much value out of a site with absolutely no regard for the amenity value of adjacent properties and no real knowledge of how people actually live.

The site is very badly served by a very thin approach road which is difficult to enter because of ever-present parked cars on Town Cross Avenue, which acts as an overspill car-park for three adjacent streets and is already heavily over-subscribed with people who want to park in it. Ten extra dwellings can only make this situation worse:

I see on the plan/elevations space for eight vehicles to park. What of the other two residences?

m/f

2/

Where will they park? Answer: in Town Cross Avenue.
With two cars per household (not unusual; my neighbour has seven vehicles) this means that an extra twelve vehicles will be searching for parking on Town Cross Avenue.

I realise that there has been some attempt to show where emergency vehicles would enter/exit but does the architect realise that West Sussex Fire Brigade uses aerial appliances which have to use outrigger/stabilizers to remain safe when used at height? This doubles their width. I see no indication of this allowance on the plan. The "tram lines" of an emergency vehicle's movement have already been cut to the bone, to the point at which I think a fire hazard exists. Look at the difference in width of the Halsom Close approach lane and that of the proposed new site. It only takes one un-attended large van to park in the proposed site's approach lane and not only all emergency vehicles are denied access, their crews are as well!

Everyday I see commercial vehicles trying to get onto the proposed site; sometimes they have to reverse in with the aid of three banksmen. The traffic congestion is considerable as a result and will only be worse with ten dwellings, as proposed.

I believe the previous owner of this site had applications for four dwellings refused and I don't see why an application for ten apartments should succeed. The adjacent site (Halsom Close) has seven dwellings but is about 50% bigger, so the over-crowding/over development factor is again evident. On the plans I see three storeys; this is unusual for the area and apart from being radically different

3/
from buildings nearby it will lead to buildings nearby being overlooked in a way that they have not been since they were built about 100 years ago.

On a more humane and mundane level, I see no space for residents of the proposed buildings to have for recreation/relaxing. I'm not talking of tennis courts; I mean a place to sit in the sun that isn't part of a tarmac road.

Where will the residents' wheelie-bins go? I see there is a small space right at the North end of the site with the cynical addition of three or four trees; it's almost as if the architect gave a second's thought to the environment.

I think this planned site is comically absurd and will be highly detrimental to the surrounding area.

Successive owners of this site have tried to over-develop it when they should bite the bullet and realise that the only successful option would be to put up one house and (in a separate building) 2 apartments.

There is a reason this site has not been developed before — money has always clouded people's good judgement. Lastly, I've seen no statutory yellow signs for this application. Doesn't that make it null and void anyway?

Best Wishes,