

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 03 October 2017 10:03
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection Letter to Planning Application: EG/69/17/PL
Importance: High

Kind Regards

Simon J.Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maitravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Claire Leighton [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 October 2017 12:16
To: Simon Davis
Cc: Ernie Yule; Mary Yule
Subject: Objection Letter to Planning Application: EG/69/17/PL
Importance: High

Dear Mr Davis

Please find attached the objection letter for planning application EG/69/17/PL. I am email the letter on behalf of Mr and Mrs Yule as they are currently experiencing a fault with their phone and internet line.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of the attached letter.

Regards

Claire Leighton

OUR REF: IO_1709261 – YULE – EG/69/17/PL

Cedar End
Eastergate Lane

Your Ref: EG/69/17/PL

Chichester
PO20 3SJ

FAO. Mr S Davis, Planning Department,
1 Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

27th September 2017

Dear Mr S Davis,

Re: Local Planning Authority Reference EG/69/17/PL

**For: 4 No. live/work units, Research & Development propagation building & growing area, garden room, fuel store & greenhouse to main dwelling & formation of new access.
(Departure from Development Plan)**

At: Swallowfield, Eastergate Lane, Eastergate, PO20 3SJ

I write in reference to the above current application to register strong objection to the current proposals on the following material grounds:

1. Planning Policy: The submitted Design & Access Statement repeatedly refers to ‘the Appeal scheme’ and ‘the Appeal site’ yet this application has yet to be fully considered by the Local Planning Authority, let alone refused and a formal Appeal lodged with the Planning Inspectorate. It is clear the Design & Access Statement is a template intended to be used on Appeal and it is therefore also clear that the applicants and their agent anticipate refusal of the current application for planning permission. The Statement makes much reference to general principles contained within the National Planning Policy Framework trying to claim that such principles should supersede the policies contained in the Arun District Local Plan which seek to restrict general housing and business development in the open countryside outside of defined sustainable settlement development limits. This is not the intention or purpose of the Framework. The Framework is one against which the current Local Plan should be measured and it is clear that the Framework does seek to protect the character of the countryside for its own sake, with new general development located within the confines of existing sustainable settlements. There is nothing in the current proposal which makes it a special exception to that principle, regardless of the desires of the applicant to increase the income they might otherwise be reasonably expected to derive from the continued horticultural use of the site. The Statement fails to follow an appropriate sequential test and assess the availability of general development land within the existing defined settlement development limit. The Statement thus fails to establish an essential, overriding need for the development which may not otherwise be satisfied. In addition, four new homes will hardly make a major contribution to the alleged lack of available housing land available to satisfy the assessed needs of the District for the next five years. The Statement fails to provide any assessment of specific requirements of the key policies relating to proper assessment and understanding of scale, impact and quality of new development upon the existing built environment and communities within them. For example, the Statement claims a high quality of design is proposed, but fails to explain in any meaningful manner how the proposal fits with the character of surrounding development or represents cutting edge design pushing the boundaries of technology and energy efficiency.

2. Community Character & Quality of Design: The proposed development form and built style is ugly and completed out of out of character with the existing urban grain and built form of the area. The work units proposed will sit within a residential area close to private residential properties that are all large and sit within substantial plots, whilst the proposed units are small and will sit within diminutive land parcels.

3. Proximity: At their nearest the proposed units will sit within just one metre of my private garden boundary. This is not even enough distance to have meaningful boundary landscaping, provide clear access between the new building and such planting and maintain a reasonable separation to ensure commercial activity is not within an intrusively close distance to the private garden boundary.

4. Noise: The area is predominantly residential and the introduction of such an intensive commercial use in to such a quiet, open, residential area will be incredibly intrusive from an aural amenity perspective, creating an intrusive industrial soundscape atypical of that which residents have experience of. Regardless of the nature of the commercial activity within the units and the level of sound proofing which might be provided, the to and fro of commercial traffic, loading and unloading, staff, customers, etc. will introduce a level of site activity which is completely abnormal to the area and the application provides no alternate access for the heavy volumes of traffic this development may attract.

5. Visual Privacy: It is one thing for your private, domestic garden to be overlooked from first floor windows of other private residential properties. This is to be expected and provides only occasional views from non-living room areas that are not subject to intensive day time use. Even in the evenings, such windows would typically be screened by drawn curtains to protect the occupant's own privacy. In commercial premises, such first floor accommodation is typically office space and this is subject to intensive use throughout the day and often late into the evenings through into the weekends, dependent upon the nature of the business. This is obviously going to have a tremendously detrimental and adverse impact upon the privacy of our home reducing substantially not only real levels of existing privacy but also substantially increasing the feeling of being overlooked and supervised on an intensive basis.

6. Pre-Application Engagement: The National Planning Policy Framework encourages developers and their professional consultants to seek the informal, non-binding opinion of officers of the Council before making a formal application for planning permission. Applicants and their agents are encouraged to engage positively and constructively at this stage to develop proposals which sit well in the location proposed, not just from a visual perspective but also from the standpoint of general planning policy and various other amenity issues, such as privacy (both visual and aural). There is no mention in the Design and Access Statement of any pre-application discussion with officers of the LPA having even been attempted. It is clear looking at the brutalist architecture of the drawn proposals they bear no relation to their surroundings and no thought has been given to how they might blend in with their setting and the immediate street scene. Concerns over likely, resultant levels of private residential amenity for existing and proposed residents have simply been ignored, with no rigorous assessment of noise, odour, privacy and/or daylight level impacts for proposed and neighbouring residents. Notwithstanding the lack of any pre-application approach to the Local Planning Authority, the agent and developer has completely failed to make any effort to engage with the local community and give them genuine opportunity to effect changes in the proposal at the pre-application stage. The development proposal thus fails to meet the necessary criteria for the quality and depth of community engagement required for developments of this scale.

I am not part of a formally constituted lobby group, but am an individual, genuinely community-focussed, local resident who is seriously concerned for the future of their neighbourhood.

I trust that the above objection, with the reasoned justification provided, will be treated with the serious consideration deserved and that the Local Planning Authority will move to refuse the current application and robustly defend such refusal on appeal.

I would be happy to provide additional information on request if any clarification is required.

I would also welcome officers and/or elected members of the Council to our properties if this would positively assist in the consideration and appreciation of the above stated grounds for objection.

Yours faithfully,

Ernie Yule