



10 Mantling Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 7DG
Tel 01903 715177
www.philbrownarch.co.uk

Mr J Smith
Planning Services
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Littlehampton
West Sussex BN17 5LF

Email phil@philbrownarch.co.uk
Mobile 07973 964044
Our ref 266
Your ref R/190/13/

25 September 2013

Dear Sir,

New Residential Dwelling at 2 Broadmark Way (rear of 20 & 22 Broadmark Lane), Rustington, West Sussex – R/190/13/

We have noticed there have been a relatively significant number of objections to this planning application. We have reviewed all the comments that have been made and would like to take the opportunity to address many of them as follows:

- *Objection - The proposed property is too large for the plot.*
Countering of objection - The proposed property has been carefully designed to fit within the plot whilst maintaining an adequate amount of outside amenity space. The distance from the front boundary wall to the front of the house would be 9.8m, and the distance from the rear of the house to the rear boundary would be 6.3m. The plot is a maximum of 18.9m wide, and the proposed property would be just 14.5m wide. Accordingly, the proposed property can be seen to fit comfortably within the plot whilst also providing an adequate amount of external amenity space.
- *Objection - Parking provision is inadequate.*
Countering of objection - The parking provision shown is entirely adequate for a house of this size as it includes both a garage and driveway parking together with a turning area. The existing access onto Broadmark Way – which has been used for the garage currently on the site – will continue to be utilised for the proposed property.
- *Objection - Unacceptable visual impact and negative effect on street scene.*
Countering of objection - The existing properties within the street comprise a variety of different sizes and styles, and there is not a coherent or consistent design pattern. The proposed property would fit within the street scene and would have a lower ridge height and eaves height than the adjacent properties. Whilst we accept that it would not necessarily replicate the appearance of any of the existing properties, it would also not appear to be out of character or obtrusive. It would appear to be subordinate in scale to other existing properties and would not dominate the street scene.

- *Objection - Loss of privacy to adjacent properties.*
Countering of objection - We do not accept there would be any loss of privacy to adjacent properties. There are no windows to the side elevations and also no windows to the rear elevation at first floor level. The windows to the front elevation would not result in any direct overlooking or resultant loss of privacy.
- *Objection – Overshadowing to adjacent properties.*
Countering of objection - The proposed property would have an eaves height of 2.25m (just 0.45m higher than the existing boundary fence to the rear of nos. 20 and 22 Broadmark Lane). The ridge height would be 6.51m. The standard method for calculating possible overshadowing is to draw a line at 25 degrees 2m up from a point on the wall of the potentially affected property. If this exercise is carried out to nos. 20 and 22 Broadmark Lane it can be seen there would not be any overshadowing effect.
- *Objection - Proposal is cramped and contrived.*
Countering of objection - It should be noted that this plot was first intended to be developed as part of the original layout of Broadmark Way as the street numbering currently commences at no.4. The plot is of a suitable size to accommodate the proposed property together with an adequate amount of off-street parking and external amenity space, and accordingly the proposal is neither cramped nor contrived. The fact that the plot does not benefit from the depth that other properties in Broadmark Way enjoy is of no real relevance.
- *Objection – Proposal is larger than previous scheme.*
Countering of objection - We accept that the footprint of the current proposal is larger than the previous scheme which was submitted as a planning application. However, it should also be noted that the plot is now considerably larger and accordingly this objection does not have any particular validity. In addition, the current scheme is for a chalet bungalow (rather than a house) with lower eaves and ridge heights than the previous scheme.
- *Objection - Proposal is for a house rather than chalet bungalow.*
Countering of objection - This objection is based on a fundamental falsehood and misinformation as the submitted drawings clearly show that the proposal is for a chalet bungalow. All first floor rooms shall be contained within the roofspace, with dormer windows to the front elevation.
- *Objection - Application is a purely commercial enterprise.*
Countering of objection - Whilst this is not a genuine reason for an objection to a planning application, we can clarify that the applicants fully intend to construct the property and occupy it as their family home. Accordingly, the proposal is not a 'purely commercial enterprise'.

We trust our comments satisfactorily address the main objections which have been raised, but please do not hesitate to contact us should you require any clarification or if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully,



Phil Brown
Director
Phil Brown (Architectural Services) Ltd