

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 April 2021 14:02
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Objection to Planning application BR/93/21/PL

Daun Johnson
Technical Support Assistant
Planning Department

T: 01903 737762
E: daun.johnson@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltrovers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning

From: Doreen Bradbury [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 April 2021 14:00
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Planning application BR/93/21/PL

Dear Planning Committee,

Objection to Planning application BR/93/21/PL

I am the leaseholder of Ground Floor Flat 24 Neville Road, sharing the drive with 22 Neville Road.

The proposed development seeks to construct a single storey dwelling to the rear of the existing dwelling at 22 Neville Road, Bognor Regis. The host dwelling itself is split into two flats, at ground floor and first floor level. The proposal details one parking space adjacent to the construction of the dwelling, and soft landscaping along the Northern and Eastern boundaries of the application site.

Whilst it is noted that Arun District Council's HLS is at 3.3 years, and therefore Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF applies, it is considered that this application conflicts with this (d(ii)) of this paragraph. This is because the proposal is considered to result in adverse impacts of which outweigh the benefits of the application. This is as a result of the very minor nature of the benefits of this speculative back land development application.

Arun Local Plan policy, D DM1 lists a series of 15 factors that development must comply with - these include character, impact and public realm. It is also necessary to consider the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework. Section 12 states that high quality buildings and places are fundamental to the planning process. Paragraph 127 sets out 5 design criteria against which development proposals will be assessed including the need to

be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. In terms of density, D DM1 requires that housing makes efficient use of land while providing a mix of dwelling types and maintaining character and local distinctiveness. Higher densities will be more appropriate in the most accessible locations.

The policy requires the scale of development to keep within the general confines of the overall character of a locality. The position of the site and its size would result in development that is not in keeping with the general pattern and scale of development in the locality.

The dwelling would be positioned close to the boundaries of the site, this is due to the contrived nature of the proposed site, as it relates to the removal of an area currently used as a residential garden for the occupiers of the existing flats. The dwelling is sited approximately 1m from these boundaries respectively, which although allows space for access to the rear (for bike storage), this constrains the proposed dwelling and looks visually at odds with the nature of similar plots within the locality which exist for parking or as residential gardens.

Having regard to the existing character and layout of the area, it is considered that the proposal would have a constrained and cramped appearance not in keeping with the established layout and pattern of development failing to integrate with its surroundings and thereby harming the character of the locality.

Indeed, whilst noted that the proposal will be constructed in similar materials to the nearby dwellings, the scale and mass of the development proposed on this contrived, awkward back land site would appear overly prominent and incongruous with the immediate built environment. Therefore, it must be concluded that the proposal would be at odds with the character and appearance of the area.

The proposals would therefore conflict with policies D DM1 and D SP1 of the Arun Local Plan which requires development to be compliant with development plan policy which includes that development has an acceptable design and impact on occupiers of land/buildings and that it responds positively to the character of the area.

Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 policy D DM1 requires that the Council have regard to certain aspects when considering new development including: (3) Impact - "Have minimal impact to users and occupiers of nearby property and land. For example, by avoiding significant loss of sunlight, privacy and outlook and unacceptable noise and disturbance."

Regard should be had to paragraph 127 of the NPPF which states that: "Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: (f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

The proposed development is considered to result in an over-intensification of the residential plot through the introduction of a separate residential unit to the rear of the existing uses.

In Section 12 of the NPPF 2019 'Achieving well-designed places' the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Paragraph 127 (f) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: 'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users'.

The site and this proposal would provide an inadequate living environment for future occupiers. While it has adequate amenity space in the rear garden, the dwelling would be sited to the rear of a terrace of flats, with separate dwellings (due to the flat uses) at ground floor level. Furthermore, the dwelling itself would be considerably set back from the street scene, giving it a contained/hemmed in feeling for prospective occupiers. Also vehicle comings and goings would add to this unsuitable surrounding living environment.

The access land to this property, whilst it is noted that it is an existing access, intensification of the use of this access should be avoided where possible, especially give the pedestrian access use of this walkway (for occupiers). It is considered that the intensification of the use of the access, whilst it may not give rise to any potential highway impact, is considered to exacerbate the inappropriate living conditions of neighbouring dwellings.

Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to comply with D DM1 & QE SP1 of the Arun District Local Plan.

It is likely that WSCC will raise concerns relating to refuse collection. As a result of the site and its long access path, it is considered that the refuse collection could be acceptable, as this will be the egress route for the site, and the refuse bins could be brought closer to the street scene.

To conclude, this proposal represents a contrived, speculative use of brownfield land, and it is felt the proposal would fail to provide adequate living environment for future and existing occupiers and be out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposal should be refused for the following reasons:

- The proposal would have the appearance of an unduly cramped form of development which would have an unacceptable impact on the established pattern of development in the locality in conflict with policies D DM1 and D SP1 of the Arun Local Plan.
- The proposed development is considered to be located in very close proximity to the adjacent plot of amenity land to the South and thereby have an overbearing and unneighbourly impact on the users of this space in conflict with policies D DM1(3) of the Arun Local Plan.

- The site, by virtue of its surrounds and location of access route is considered unsuitable to accommodate a dwelling that provides a suitable living environment for future and existing residential occupiers in conflict with policies D DM1 and QE SP1 of the Arun Local Plan.

Yours faithfully

Doreen Bradbury