

Mr A Seggie
2 Cyprus Villas
River Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5BY

Mrs Gardener
Planning Consent
Arun District Council
Littlehampton

Reference LU/126/19/PL

I wish to lodge my objection to the development listed for planning consent covering 25 River Road and the frontage of Terminus Place

1. The overall plans is to build 9 flats comprising 1 and two bed accommodation

These are projected to house 2 persons in the 1 bed room flats and 4 persons in the 2 bedroom flats.

A total of an additional 28 residents in the development with the possibility of 28 vehicles to be parked

2. The river road frontage no 25 - The space between my property, 2 Cyprus Villas and no 27 River Road - The plans in principle of size and space are in keeping with my property and that of 27 River Road

2a. I do have objections on the grounds of number of parking spaces provided - 3 in number - for a total of 6 occupants

2b. This will also remove 1 on road parking space currently used by local residents - to allow access to under-croft area - putting added pressure on the local residents on road parking thereby only providing 2 extra parking spaces but the possibility of additional 6 vehicles

3. Terminus Road frontage - I object to due to the following

3a The height of the development is over 1 third higher than existing properties North - , East and south of it see pic 1 for current street view and building heights




pic 1

3b It will have an impact on my privacy due to my secluded garden planned to be overlooked by all the residents on the south elevation of the building see pic 2



Pic on left Current view showing Building in Pic 1 street view

Pic on right pic 2 will be view after development



3c – ref 9.38 of Planning Statement submitted by Hall Homes

There is significant impact to properties in the block north of the development- shown in Pic 1 , due to the light being blocked due to their aspect and the scale of the development

3d ref 9.39 – mentions their own development not having living accommodation on the ground floor on the North Side due to light issues – but they have designed a building that will block others

3e. ref 9.40 – I refute this statement as the design of the windows will be overlooking and directly looking into my bedroom window at the rear of my property

3f ref 9.41 I refute this statement due to the above and those to follow – cars and noise

3g ref 9.44 amenity space – no external space has been provided other than adjacent to the open air parking for 1 car at the rear of the property in River Road and the undercroft area on the Terminus Place development

3h ref 9.45 Alleyway – currently my property is secure on the West Side due to the existing building. The introduction of an alleyway raises potential access area to my property

3i. in conjunction with 9.45 -

what is the height of the wall going to be?

(Shown on the plan and acts as a boundary between my plot and the development plot from the rear of the River Road development and the gated access, through to the single open air car parking area and the alleyway that forms along the West and North Boundary)

3j. 9.47 – I refute this statement – It does not provide individual parking spaces for all units

There is provision for 6 parking spaces for 9 flats and potential for 28 occupants –and upwards of 28 cars.

The forecourt area in Terminus Place is currently used to park four local resident vehicles and the space on road in front of the unused River Road entrance is used by local residents

Therefore the scheme introduces 6 parking spaces, with possibly 28 additional car user and the loss of 5 current parking spaces means a total of 27 car user will be looking for parking in River Road

I would suggest that this is ridiculously low and completely inadequate.

3k. The development of the Social club in Terminus Road, whereby no parking was provided as believed not required and the local car parks were sufficient This and the new development would put a significant strain on the already overburdened street parking

3l. The development of Mariners Quay and Fishermans Quay – as part of the planning – the developer was to provide two parking spaces per dwelling – which I believe they have by utilising space one in front of the other in the allocated driveways – the resident however do not stick to this and currently use the on street parking for their second vehicles – putting strain on the local OS parking

3m. 9.48 I refute this statement – The site is not in controlled parking zone and there is not a resident parking scheme in operation that uses parking permits

3n. 9.49 I refute this statement as it does not and it will have a major impact on the parking conditions

3o. 9.50 I refute this statement – The garage has not been in operation for upwards 24 months . When the unit was used as a garage there was minimal impact on pedestrians and road users as the majority of the works were carried out mon- Friday 8am to 5pm. The owner/ occupiers always had

someone on the footway when making access and egress – something that I doubt the new residents will be able to comply with and possibly put pedestrians at greater risk

The introduction of the undercroft parking in both areas will produce a similar amount of journeys

3p. 9.51 I suggest that this also be used to deny the application as the impact of the cumulative developments , Terminus Road, Mariners Quay, Fishermans Quay and this one have had a significant impact in the local on street and off street parking

3q. 9.52 I refute this statement for the same reasons stated at 30. 9.50 as it also is a repeat

Within the planning portal I was unable to copy all explanations due to the character limitation

You can see below that I have submitted my objection

Your comments relating to application **LU/126/19/PL** have been registered, your reference is **OWPC23194**

I look forward to receiving an acknowledgement – which can be by email or telephone

Yours sincerely


Andrew Seggie