



Improving the wellbeing of Arun

Delivering the right homes in the right places

Supporting our environment to support us

Fulfilling Arun's economic potential

ARUN
DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Adam King [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 August 2025 19:49
To: Harry Chalk <Harry.Chalk@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>; Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Planning Application R/58/25/PL at The Bungalow, Station Road, Rustington, BN16 3BA

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Mr Chalk,

We write to object in the strongest terms to the planning application for a new three-bedroom dwelling with a large garage and accommodation above at The Bungalow, Station Road, Rustington, BN16 3BA. I understand from the Arun Portal that you are the Case Officer.

We own 47 Park Drive, immediately to the west of the application site, and the proposal would cause material harm to our residential amenity, to the character of the area, and to highway safety.

A summary of our principal objections are:

1. Excessive overbearing impact, loss of outlook, and loss of daylight/sunlight

- The dwelling is set approximately 2.5 metres from our boundary, an unacceptably tight separation that would create a dominant and oppressive mass to our garden and the rear elevation of No. 47.
- The height, roof pitch, and proximity would materially reduce daylight and sunlight to our rear garden and rear-facing rooms, especially during lower sun angles, contrary to good practice (e.g., 25/45-degree and overshadowing considerations).
- The scale reads as a two-storey form, not a bungalow, presenting a looming roofscape that would diminish outlook from principal rooms.

2. Unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy

- Three rooflights facing our property (serving a bedroom, bathroom, and landing) introduce direct and perceived overlooking into our private garden, eroding the reasonable level of privacy currently enjoyed.
- Arun's established design guidance typically expects rear garden depths of around 11 metres to safeguard privacy and avoid overbearing relationships. This proposal is a cramped insertion that fails to provide appropriate separation and falls short of safeguarding neighbouring amenity.

3. Incongruous scale and massing in a constrained plot

- The proposed volume has been shoehorned into a restricted site, resulting in overdevelopment that is out of keeping with the prevailing pattern, spacing, and grain of development on Park Drive.
- The massing, roof form, and minimal setbacks cumulatively harm local character and the established sense of openness between dwellings.

4. Ancillary building with harmful scale and likely intensification

- The new garage, built to the boundary with 45 Park Drive, incorporates a large roof to accommodate a first-floor "office," creating additional bulk and overshadowing to neighbouring gardens.
- The specification and layout raise a clear risk of later conversion or incidental use as residential accommodation, further intensifying activity and amenity impacts.

5. Highway safety concerns

- The proposed access is inherently unsafe: visibility to the east is effectively nil due to a roadside wall; to the west it is significantly constrained by a telegraph pole and planting.
- Additional vehicle movements at a substandard access would exacerbate highway risk for drivers and pedestrians, contrary to basic safety requirements and the need for adequate visibility splays.

6. Policy conflict (local and national)

- The development would cause demonstrable harm to neighbouring amenity through overbearing presence, loss of privacy and outlook, and loss of daylight/sunlight- contrary to Arun District Council's design and amenity standards.

- The proposal represents clear and unambiguous overdevelopment that fails to respect local character, spacing, and pattern of development, contrary to good design principles in the NPPF and relevant Local Plan policies.
- Substandard access arrangements undermine highway safety, conflicting with policies requiring safe and suitable access for all users.

For the reasons set out above - overbearing massing, loss of privacy and outlook, loss of daylight and sunlight, overdevelopment of a constrained plot, harmful ancillary building, and unsafe access - the application would cause significant and unjustified harm.

It very clearly conflicts with established amenity, design, and highway safety policies and should therefore be refused.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of our objection and that it will be taken into account in your determination.

Yours sincerely,

Adam and Fran King
Owners, 47 Park Drive, Rustington

Kind Regards

Adam King BA (Hons) BArch
Director

ECE Architecture

ECE Group announces summer promotions. Read more about our talented team [here](#).



64-68 Brighton Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 2EN

Privacy/Confidentiality Statement

www.ecearchitecture.com

ECE Architecture Limited, Registered in England No 02360025, Registered Office Amelia House, Crescent Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1QR.