

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 February 2020 14:13
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: FAO: Zac Denton / Planning Application EP/160/19/PL

rep

Daun Johnson | Technical Support Unit Assistant, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: GroundFloor, Phoenix House,
Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37762 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737762 | E-mail: daun.johnson@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Gemma Brodie [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 February 2020 14:07
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FAO: Zac Denton / Planning Application EP/160/19/PL

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application EP/160/19/PL

Land to the rear of 43 Sea Road, East Preston

Demolish redundant external store and former outside toilet at rear of 43 Sea Road and construct a single storey extension to create a 2 bedroom apartment

We write to object to the above planning application for a number of reasons as follows:-

1. The application description refers to demolishing an external store and former outside toilet. This external store was, until recently, accessed from the commercial unit at ground floor and is clearly part of this unit. Therefore section 17 on the application forms should record these areas as a loss of non-residential floorspace.
2. Under section 6, the planning application forms refer to the current use of the site as garden that is no longer in use. The facts are that the site contains a structure that until recently was part of the commercial unit and the remaining garden is actually amenity for the first floor flat. This garden has been enjoyed by the flat resident for 18 years.
3. The OS plan submitted is labelled incorrectly. It shows no.43 and 45 at the same location. The property to the south of 43 should be noted as 45.
4. The area of the proposed new dwelling is larger than the existing building and would more than double the existing footprint which is therefore clearly over-development.
5. The backland development of this site is out of character with the surrounding area and does not reflect the density or mix locally and is therefore contrary to Policy.
6. The proposal is to looking to squeeze in 3 units on a limited site by removing amenity space that is required to serve the existing first floor flat as required by current planning policy.
7. The proposal is inconsistent with the surrounding architectural styles.
8. The drawings do not provide any dimensions to check if the scheme complies with the National Space Standards.
9. There are no height dimensions to be able to properly appreciate the impact on the neighbouring properties and their amenity spaces. However the building will be clearly visible from the neighbouring gardens creating an overbearing detrimental effect on their outlook and amenity spaces, especially the garden that serves the residential unit at 45b Sea Road.
10. As stated in the Local Plan, 'amenity space should be of a high standard and adequate size for the development'. This cannot be achieved by removing amenity space that serves an existing residential unit and has done for a number of years.
11. This development will impact the privacy and outlook of the neighbouring gardens and create a negative sense of enclosure.
12. The application provides no car parking contrary to the Arun District Council Parking Standards and the Arun Design Guide SPD which requires 2 parking spaces for residential dwellings of 1-3 bedrooms.

13. The existing commercial unit and the first floor residential flat do not have any parking provision. Adding another residential unit will add further parking stress to the current congestion.

14. The train station is a good 20 minutes walk away.

15. The garden does not comply with the Arun Design Guide SPD. The guide requires rear gardens of minimum depth of 10.5m and minimum of 14m between habitable rooms and the side gable of the adjacent property.

16. The scheme will create long and narrow alleyways contrary to Arun Design Guide SPD.

17. The neighbour at no.45 is very elderly and uses a mobility scooter on a daily basis. They have concerns that should this application be allowed their access will be compromised especially throughout the construction process.

18. The proposal will have an un-neighbourly overbearing effect on its immediate neighbours.

19. In conclusion, this proposal would result in a detrimental form of development out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality that would be harmful to the amenities currently enjoyed by the adjoining occupiers.

20. The proposed development is clearly not 'harmonious' with its surroundings and does not respect, improve and enhance the existing surrounding environment as required by Arun Local Plan.

21. This development is proposed on a garden currently being enjoyed by the first floor flat.

22. The proposal does not protect the amenity of the site, immediate neighbours, and surrounding area, but does create harm to the adjoining residents by causing material overlooking, loss of privacy, and an overbearing outlook and a visual enclosure.

I trust you will agree the application cannot be approved for the above reasons.

Yours faithfully,

G Brodie

On behalf of a concerned neighbour (further details available if required).