

Assistant Director of Planning
Arun District Planning
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
WEST SUSSEX
BN17 5LF

1 South Road
Felpham
Bognor Regis
WEST SUSSEX
PO22 8EF

25th September 2017

Dear Sir,

Re: Application FP/177/17/OUT No 9 Downview Road

My wife and I are strongly opposed to this application for back garden development.

We believe it would be in all respects damaging to and out of character with the present surroundings and that no mitigating measures could sufficiently compensate those nearby.

Development in this part of Felpham has taken place in phases over many years, each phase reflecting circumstances at the time to give various areas of distinctive character. The earliest of these was on land to the west of Downview Road, which is still today characterised by dwellings set in ample gardens.

While the wider public are not free to roam over these gardens, they nevertheless benefit greatly from their general greening of the neighbourhood, and much of the wildlife they support will also visit them in their own gardens.

From the proposal's block plan (below), it would appear that Downview Road has an imbalanced level of development between its east and west sides:



However, the reason for this is better understood when pulling back to gain a wider view (below), in which it becomes clear that Downview Road is in fact the interface between the original development to the west (yellow), and the much later development to the east (magenta).



Both the yellow and magenta areas are of 3.33 hectares, giving dwellings per hectare (DPH) of 8.4 and 25.2. Or one could simply say that development to the east is three times the density of that to the west.

The contrast shown above demonstrates the interest and variety offered by Felpham, which we feel should not be blurred into one amorphous mass. And indeed, nowhere else in this part of Felpham has there been any 'backland' development of the kind proposed.

This Application proposes a dwelling on "vacant land", while later indicating it is not vacant, but also describes this land's 'existing use' as "wasteland", both of which this 2015 Google Earth capture clearly shows are not the case:



As with gardens nearby, it is in fact well-tended garden land and the site even takes in a third of No 9's principle lawn.

The term "wasteland" also carries with it the suggestion that this land is in some way brownfield or previously-developed land, which it clearly is not; it is "private residential garden land", within the built-up boundary.

It is our view that to insert even one extra dwelling in gardens of the yellow area would show no respect whatever for its long established character.

If someone had made their home next to vacant or previously used land, which could be expected one day to be developed, the situation would be somewhat different.

In this case though, we feel that any development of these gardens would adversely and unreasonably impact those of the surrounding community, who wish to continue with and pass on enjoyment of the properties they have chosen.

We therefore hope very much that this application will be refused.

Yours sincerely

Mr & Mrs Shattock