

Mr D Easton
Case Officer
Planning Department
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF



2 The Cedars
Hurst Road
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16 3AP

Application Ref: R/64/17/PL

6 July 2017

Re: St Mary's Close redevelopment

Dear Mr Easton,

Once again we feel compelled to submit our objections to MJH's amended proposal for the development of 4 houses in Hurst Road.

The main change to the proposal is to remove the 2 garage blocks in front of the building line but to make this possible the house on plot 4 now has an integral garage which makes the house wider. To accommodate a wider house on the site, 2 of the other houses have been shuffled closer together, making the space between them even narrower. This makes the whole development look even denser and even more out of character with the rest of the road.

Hurst Road is a delightful tree lined road with beautifully kept grass verges and consisting of individually styled properties in ample sized plots where driveway parking for several cars is provided.

We understand that any proposals should take into account the density of the site and should be sympathetic to its surroundings. Sadly it is crystal clear that this is not the case with this development, as the proposed houses would be squeezed even closer together than the rest of the properties in Hurst Road. It must be said that the drawings (151117-SS-01 Rev.D) of the proposed development show the houses to be spaced well apart from each other when in fact this is clearly not the case and is to our minds a shrewd and cunning way of giving the wrong impression. We feel that a maximum of 3 individually styled properties would mirror the existing properties opposite and would be in keeping with the size of each plot in this road.

Secondly, the character of the road will be spoilt by the development of 4 nearly identical (apart from fascias) modern looking properties that are completely out of keeping with the rest of the road and would in no way respect, improve or enhance the existing surrounding environment and in fact they would stick out like a sore thumb.

Thirdly, we are concerned that there will not be adequate parking with this proposed development and that there will be an overspill of cars parked on the road especially as the amended proposal has 2 fewer parking spaces than the original plans. This has been proven by the 2 new developments in Station Road where there is now a permanent array of cars parked on

Station Road which makes it a hazard trying to get in and out of Hurst Road and is indeed a potential risk of an accident waiting to happen. I would, however, point out that parking on Hurst Road contravenes the Hurst Road Association road policy.

We strongly urge you to take into account the above legitimate reasons why this proposed development should not go ahead in its present form and to give it serious consideration for rejection.

Many thanks,

Yours sincerely

