

*SM*  
**Julie Grieves**

---

**From:** Susan Leeson  
**Sent:** 07 November 2011 07:50  
**To:** Planning.Responses  
**Subject:** FW: Planning permission FP/179/11/  
**Attachments:** Planning permission Nov 11.doc

Susan Leeson BSc(hons), MPhil | Principal Planner, Planning and Housing Strategy, Arun District Council |  
Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at [www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)



Save the environment - think before you print.

**From:** Stanley Riseborough  
**Sent:** 06 November 2011 18:25  
**To:** Susan Leeson  
**Subject:** Planning permission FP/179/11/

Dear Mrs Leeson,  
Please find attached my letter of objection to the above planning permission. I have also sent a hard copy in the post.

Kind Regards

Stanley Riseborough

**ACK**

07/11/2011

to advocate for this development in the planning design statement does not accurately reflect the reality of the proposal. May I highlight this below. The proposal suggests:

- I. **There is "adequate turning space on site"** – Realistically there is inadequate space for 11 vehicles
- II. **There is "better use of land" while "respecting the private amenity space of adjacent properties and is sympathetic to their proportions"** – As a neighbor this development is too large, I believe it to be intrusive and significantly reduce my privacy. The existing building fits very well with the character of the road and area. To create a building of this size with all the associate activity would change this character and create a point of significant travel risk on the apex of this corner.
- III. **The property is "designed to visually integrate with the adjacent properties"** – no, whilst the front is designed to achieve this, the size of the development at the side and the back does not visually integrate, because it is of a disproportionate size to properties at the side and back.
- IV. **There will be "terrace or balconies"** – either would overlook neighboring properties and take away existing privacy and enable views into our sitting room and kitchen.

Underpinning this proposal is the development of basement car parking on this site. Whilst I do not understand the flooding issues fully the road outside this property has flooded on a number of occasions (approx 6) during the last 5 years since we have lived in the area. I would want to be assured that this development did not increase the risk of flooding to any neighboring property.

In summary I would ask that these proposals are not approved. They significantly increase traffic volume, on a dangerous corner, in an area well used by school children. They take away any privacy that we may have had building balconies or terraces overlooking our back garden, natural light into our sitting room is greatly reduced and the size and scale of the build is wholly out of keeping with the area.

I would be grateful if these matters could receive your consideration

Yours faithfully

Stanley Riseborough

SAN

Stanley Riseborough  
Montfort House,  
28a Limmer Lane,  
Felpham,  
Sussex  
PO22 7ET

ACK

06/11/11

Dear Mrs. Leeson,

Re: Planning Permission 30, Limmer Lane, Ref: FP/179/11/

I write to raise objections against the above proposals.

The site for the proposed planning is located on the inside of a deceptive bend, with a T junction opposite. The bend drops or rises by about 8-10 feet dependent on direction of travel along the road, causing diminished visibility for cars traveling either way. The road is used as a rat run for cars attempting to avoid the traffic along the main Felpham road and is notorious for speeding cars. Attempts to reduce the speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph have been considered, but at the moment a 30 mph speed limit is in place. The road only has a foot path on one side of the road and is a route home for very many school children during the morning and afternoon.

The intention to create dwellings for 12 people, with 11 parking places and access onto the road at the point of this bend creates significantly safety risks. Not only for people exiting the new properties but also for those traveling along the road exiting the T junction and children making their way to or from school. As a parent of 3 children going to local schools I am obviously very concerned about the risks this would pose.

As neighbors to the site of the new development this proposal would create a building over twice the current size and extend a substantial way down the side of our garden (more than the length of our house again). Our garden and house would be overseen, not just by one new dwelling but by 2 flats and terraces/balconies. The implications of this are that we lose most of our privacy.

The proposed new build runs very close to the edge of our external wall and then continues on further. The effect of this will be to significantly diminish the natural light into our sitting room, particularly as this is a south facing room.

The scale and the nature of the proposed plan also radically change the character of the immediate area and are not in keeping with the scale of property. Without wishing to be dramatic the proposed plans are enormous. One 3 bedroom house is being replaced by 6 flats and 11 parking spaces. Whilst I do appreciate the right to redevelop, this does seem out of all proportion to the existing building and area. I am concerned the language used

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

- 8 NOV 2011

RECEIVED



to advocate for this development in the planning design statement does not accurately reflect the reality of the proposal. May I highlight this below. The proposal suggests:

- I. **There is "adequate turning space on site"** – Realistically there is inadequate space for 11 vehicles
- II. **There is "better use of land" while "respecting the private amenity space of adjacent properties and is sympathetic to their proportions"** – As a neighbor this development is too large, I believe it to be intrusive and significantly reduce my privacy. The existing building fits very well with the character of the road and area. To create a building of this size with all the associate activity would change this character and create a point of significant travel risk on the apex of this corner.
- III. **The property is "designed to visually integrate with the adjacent properties"** – no, whilst the front is designed to achieve this, the size of the development at the side and the back does not visually integrate, because it is of a disproportionate size to properties at the side and back.
- IV. **There will be "terrace or balconies"** – either would overlook neighboring properties and take away existing privacy and enable views into our sitting room and kitchen.

Underpinning this proposal is the development of basement car parking on this site. Whilst I do not understand the flooding issues fully the road outside this property has flooded on a number of occasions (approx 6) during the last 5 years since we have lived in the area. I would want to be assured that this development did not increase the risk of flooding to any neighboring property.

In summary I would ask that these proposals are not approved. They significantly increase traffic volume, on a dangerous corner, in an area well used by school children. They take away any privacy that we may have had building balconies or terraces overlooking our back garden, natural light into our sitting room is greatly reduced and the size and scale of the build is wholly out of keeping with the area.

I would be grateful if these matters could receive your consideration

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Stanley Riseborough.

Stanley Riseborough



Jonathan Gilbert  
3 St Marys Court  
Limmer Lane  
Felpham  
Bognor Regis  
PO22 7EU

Your Ref: 000011686  
Our Ref: FP/179/11/  
Please ask for:  
Mrs S Leeson

1st November 2011

Dear Sir/Madam

**The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)**

---

Demolition of existing dwelling & outbuildings & erection of 6 no. apartments with associated parking & landscaping (re-submission following FP/182/10/)

30 Limmer Lane Bognor Regis

---

Thank you for your internet representation made on 31st October 2011 which has been recorded as **an objection** with the comments as follows:

*I believe that the site will be over developed and not in keeping with the locality. The increase in cars and traffic into the Lane will create more accident possibilities especially as it is already very busy and there are limited sight lines on the exit of this development.* □

□  
*Six flats are too many and will not be in keeping with no 32 which is 4 flats. The underground parking would be foolish as there is already a huge problem with excess flooding in the lane. If water cannot drain from the ground where the car park will be it will have to travel elsewhere thus causing problems in neighbouring gardens and the road. The flooding is so bad it is often not possible to access the driveway on foot to number 32 and other local properties because of the height of the water.* □

*It is interesting to note that none of the Public Houses in the village have cellars, presumably due to the water table. The rear buiding line will be encroaching on the light for the flats at number 32 and will be unsightly. I am also concerned that the underground parking will not be done and eventually the roof line will be made higher which again will not be in keeping with the area.* □

□

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts  
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy