

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 April 2021 07:44
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Representation against FP/86/21/PL

Daun Johnson
Technical Support Assistant
Planning Department

T: 01303 737762
E: daun.johnson@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltrovers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning

From: garry french [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 April 2021 21:39
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Representation against FP/86/21/PL

Further to the submission of the new planning application submitted on behalf of Ms Bottomley, I am writing to express my representations against the proposed development; FP/86/21/PL.

Although more to the scale of the surrounding properties, the proposed development has been designed in a way that causes it to fail to match the street scene; grey windows, grey roofing, buff grey brickwork and weatherboarding are all a departure from the other properties in the vicinity and at once the design appears at odds with the established surroundings. The building is also 15 centimetres taller than that it will be constructed in the garden of, with the reason for this given as "to allow sufficient headroom" but I fail to understand how this is required - is the headroom of the existing property not sufficient enough?

Having reviewed the proposal; I am at once struck by how there would only be a distance of approximately 2.199 metres between the landing window and that of the existing property and that proposed. Furthermore, the design would have bedroom windows located approximately just 14.7 metres between the landing of my own property and that proposed, and the property's window line would run parallel to that of my heavily glazed kitchen; providing an unobstructed view into the living areas of both properties, making the living conditions of both parties most uncomfortable.

The planning statement advises the land the property would be overlooking in our garden is used as a hard standing for vehicular storage. However, this is an inaccurate and ill advised statement as the land is used for this purpose during the winter months to try and ease parking congestion in the already congested cul-de-sac. During the summer months however, this land is used as a functional patio for garden gatherings, and I must highlight how the overlooking of this would significantly reduce the amenity value of this.

Further to the issue of parking, I notice that on the original planning application, West Sussex County Council raised concerns over the functional accessibility of the driveway, with concerns that it was just 2.8 meters wide, dropping to 2.4 metres, at the gateway. Despite this, the newly submitted plans do not make any attempt to address this. Furthermore, WSCC requested to see a demonstration via swept path that the awkwardly angled proposed parking spaces could be easily manoeuvred into and out of; again, a concern I see the applicant has failed to address. The cul-de-sac has been subject to disputes over parking problems for a number of years and these can only be exasperated by an additional dwelling - especially if the parking spaces prove to be too irregularly angled for frequent and accessible usage. The width of the driveway also begs the question how goods vehicles will get materials onto and off of the site, without damaging my property.

The plans suggest that a shared brick pier will be removed, but as of yet, I have not been approached regarding this coming down, and I will not be giving consent for this to happen by means of a party wall agreement.

When reviewing the ecological report for the property, it is mentioned that the proposed development would have two bee bricks, three swift bricks and one bat tube. I note however, that the plans shown for this are for the originally proposed dwelling, rather than that the application relates to, and I cannot see any indication of these on the plans generated for the new proposal. I therefore question whether these are intended to be followed through with, as have not seen where they would feature on the actual property, should it be constructed.

The Felpham Neighbourhood plan advises that development proposals must be designed to retain trees of good arboricultural or amenity value. The garden of 7 Ambleside Close, as shown by the screenshots attached courtesy of Google Earth, show that as far back as 2001, the garden had been home to a boundary of beautiful, maturing trees. These trees, with the exception of one were felled in 2020 to facilitate the development of the original application, and whilst I appreciate these cannot be re-erected, I am concerned that permitting an application to proceed because the trees have already been felled, encourages others to fall their trees to help them get planning approval.

I also note how the flood risk assessment shows the area as "low probability of flooding". However, a search on the government long term flood risk website shows the properties in the close as being in a medium risk flood area, with a 1-3.3% risk of surface water flooding each year. The photograph attached portrays how the cul-de-sac is already liable to surface water flooding, and this was not an isolated occurrence. Unless I have missed description of this, the proposal does not state what the patio and driveway for the new property would be made of, and I am most concerned that additional impermeable surfacing can only exacerbate the flood risk.

In conclusion to all of the above points, whilst I note the new application is a marked difference from that originally placed, it fails to address a number of concerns previously raised and I therefore wholly object to this application.

Yours sincerely

Garry French





PO22.8NG



PO22-8NG



PO22 8NG



