

Richard and Lorraine Rose
28 The Poplars
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 6GZ

22 August 2012

Dear Sirs

Objection to Planning Application LU/182/12 Ref: INET00013497

We wish to strongly object to the revised application submitted, which is substantially the same as the previous application which was refused earlier this year, for permission to develop seven dwellings at the end of The Poplars estate. We repeat the objections we raised in respect of the previous application, which apply equally to this one, namely:

1) The existing estate road is inadequate to serve any more dwellings. The road is narrow and already suffers from an unacceptable amount of street parking which makes manoeuvering in and out of the estate difficult and dangerous and cars always have to approach the blind corner leaving the estate, on the wrong side of the road due to cars parking directly on the corner. This will be aggravated with additional cars using the estate road and additional cars parking on it from the proposed development.

   Emergency and delivery vehicles already struggle to access the estate, hence the post at the corner by no 5 has not been replaced, having been knocked down repeatedly by larger vehicles attempting to access the estate, which have to do so by mounting the pavement. This is already a danger and it is unacceptable to further increase this traffic flow, especially with the construction traffic and removal vans which will need to gain access along this narrow road to reach the proposed development. We have already witnessed the inadequacy of the existing road, as construction vehicles for the neighbouring Poplars estate (which the developer is still building) regularly wrongly turn into our estate and then struggle to turn around and have to do so on the section of private road which is inadequate for heavy goods vehicles.

   We note that the developer has mentioned improving and enhancing the current road, but has not provided any details of what they propose to do. It is not possible to widen the road without resulting in a total loss of our footpaths, which would be hazardous.

2) The proposed development will totally remove our outlook onto the existing open space and reduce the open space land in that area to an unacceptably small amount. This is an area which had been designated as a play area and open space in a previous planning agreement.

3) Despite claims by the developer that the existing pumping station is adequate to serve further dwellings, in practice this is just not true. It already struggles to serve the existing number of dwellings and has in the past overflowed a number of times. It is a very real

concern to the residents, and any further houses connected into the foul drainage system will cause a very real health and environmental risk to the residents.

4) Mature trees on the site of the proposed development were hacked down just weeks before the original application was submitted, as well as large amounts of the existing hedge alongside the A259 being removed, leaving large gaps in the hedge and an unacceptable increase in noise pollution. We now constantly notice the level of traffic noise from the A259, as well as visibly seeing the traffic, as soon as we step out of our house, and also hear it from inside our house, even with the windows closed. We note that the developer proposes to provide special glazing for the new houses to protect the new residents, but this will not reduce the level of noise they will hear in their gardens or when they have their windows open and it will be unacceptable for them being directly adjacent to such a busy noisy road.

5) The development will be a major eye sore and inconvenience to all the existing residents throughout the construction process.

6) The development would be over-development of the area, which is already densely developed, and cause a severe loss of privacy for all the surrounding residents. There is also no requirement for any further housing in such close proximity when a number of the houses on the developer's adjacent development remain unsold.

For the above reasons, we trust that you will reject this application, which in essence is simply a re-submission of the previous one and which is equally unacceptable.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Lorraine and Richard Rose