

11 South Road.
Felpham,
Bognor Regis.
WEST SUSSEX
PO22 8EF

11 April 2019

Planning Department
Arun District Council,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

**Further Objections - Planning Statement and Street Scene
Ref Application FP/30/19/PL - 10 South Road, Felpham
Re-submission of FP/234/17/PL – Land to the rear of 10 South Road**

Dear Sir,

We wish to maintain our previously registered objection to the planning application submitted for 10, South Road, Felpham, Bognor Regis.

We wish to raise further additional points of objection relating to content of the Street Scene and the Planning Statement both of which appeared on the planning portal today.

We want to be fair to the use of your time and so we have truncated our response to cover only the top few percent of our concerns. We could easily have written a lot more.

STREET SCENE

This sketch is **inaccurate and misleading**. It grossly misrepresents the depiction of Number 11 as it exists today, nor does it include the constructions (mentioned in the planning statement) being built in the drive, nor does it show the correct relationship between number 8 and 9, nor does it give an impression of what the view through would be. With all these major errors how can the drawing have any credible standing?

PLANNING STATEMENT

We make the following comments picking up on the paragraphing used in the statement.

Background.

1. Says 'The inspector raised no objections to the property being developed nor the principle of backland development' – both aspects of this statement are **incorrect**.

The inspector in June 2018 refers to the inappropriateness of the development [in this position]. Amongst his many comments he particularly highlighted:

- The introduction of prominent urban development, and the resultant harm to the character or the area, would introduce a pattern of development that would be harmful to the verdant and sylvan style of this cul de-sac.

- The development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- The proposal would not contribute to or enhance the built environment.
- The proposal would conflict with saved Policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 criteria (ii) - development responds positively to the identified characteristic of the area.

The inspector in May 2017 said about backland use and development on this site:

- Development on this site would affect the character and appearance of the area.
- This area of Felpham does not have any other 'backland' development similar to what is proposed.
- The site did not contribute to local character by creating a sense of place appropriate to its location.
- There would be an impact to users and occupiers of nearby property and land, such as over-looking issue and loss of privacy.
- The character of the area is defined by detached houses and bungalows in large gardens, with a distinctive and secluded feel.
- The long rear gardens behind the houses largely prevent views through to other houses. Mature trees give the area a sylvan feel.
- Proposed vegetation screening carried no assurance that any planting in private gardens or off the site would or could be retained or maintained by imposing a planning condition.

Background

2. Says 'The inspector did however object solely on the fact that the driveway created a narrow entrance.' This statement is **incorrect**.

The great majority of the wording and points of objection from the inspector related to issues other than the driveway. Many other aspects were of significant concern to the inspector such as the harm to the character of the area the development would cause, its inappropriateness and the way it would conflict with local plans.

The May 2107 inspector had fundamental issues about the houses having direct views into the rear private garden areas of South Road and should be prevented from being built in this way.

Access – Landscaping and boundary treatments

3. Says a lot about the planting of hedges and trees. This is **false hope**.

The May 2017 inspector said: Proposed vegetation screening carried no assurance that any planting in private gardens or off the site would or could be retained or maintained by imposing a planning condition.

The management of these several linear expanses of vegetation would be a particular burden for the new occupant and, plants such as Photinia Red Robin, are notoriously difficult to cultivate into a compact and manageable form. The financial burden could quickly lead to the disappearance of most, or all, of the proposed planting.

Siting, height bulk and massing

4. Says a bit about three previous structures on this ground. This is an **unworthy** argument.

The three buildings were a small timber garden shed, a small domestic greenhouse and a domestic swimming pool with an occasional polytunnel cover. Hardly urban buildings.

Garage and turning areas

5. Refers to a lay-by for large delivery vehicles and an air-conditioned shed for deliveries which will be built in the driveway. We are unable to locate either of these on the block diagram and we are not sure how they have emerged from seemingly nowhere. These facilities seem quite **incongruous** in a quiet residential road and we are not convinced that they wouldn't present nuisance to other properties.

Sir, we have highlighted some of our concerns and we hope this is enough to indicate that these are seriously flawed documents.

Yours Sincerely



Ken & Jacqui Lloyd