

Tracey Young and Andrew Kenyon  
1, The Cedars  
Hurst Road  
East Preston  
Bn16 3AP

**Your Ref:** OWPC14577  
**Our Ref:** R/64/17/PL 17-03-2017  
**Please ask for:**  
Mr D Easton

13th July 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)**  
**Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015**

---

Demolition of 1 No. dwelling & erection of 4 No. dwellings. This application affects the character & appearance of the Station Road, East Preston Conservation Area.

St. Marys Close Hurst Road Rustington

---

Thank you for your internet representation made on 12th July 2017 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

*We have reviewed the amended plans for the proposed development on the St Mary's Close Plot and wish to reaffirm our objections. In fact we feel the new plans are even less in keeping with the rest of Hurst Road, being more uniform and more intrusive to neighbouring properties*

*In addition, we make reference to the Rustington Local Plan DSP 1, Design which states "development proposals must consider the efficient use of land, layout, landscape and its setting, density, mix, scale, massing, materials, finish, architectural details and nearby habitats: we feel the proposed development contravenes all points. " Whilst it could be argued that cramming four houses into the proposed site meets the criteria of "efficient" the development fails on the other criteria. Hurst Road is a road where no two houses look the same. Even the newest buildings, 1 and 2 The Cedars look very different. The proposed development does not, as the developer says, consist of 4 unique designs but four houses of two designs and the use of different finishes does not detract from this. This is totally out of keeping with the other properties in the road. However, all the houses on the road do have one thing in common, large frontages, with all of the existing houses in Hurst Road opening out directly onto the road with the householders maintaining the corresponding greensward. Again this is not the case with the proposed development, with it looking very much like a mini housing estate, totally out of keeping with the layout, density, mix, scale and nearby habitats in Hurst Road.*

**Parking**

*In considering this we make reference to the Rustington Neighbourhood Plan which states "The following design principles will apply to development proposals: On road and off road parking provision on developments should meet local guidelines, and applications where it can be shown exceed these criteria are encouraged." The developer, In theory, has adhered to this, however closer inspection of the plan shows a totally unrealistic parking layout, based on all residents using their garages for the storage of cars and being willing to block each other's cars in their driveways. The developer, at our meeting on 27th April, seemed to show a total lack of understanding of how people live their lives. It is a fact that many people never use their garages to store their cars and the need for residents to come and go would mean that parking nose to tail would not be an option. This is perfectly illustrated in the Churchfields and Langmeads Close developments where cars often spill onto the road despite having the correct number of parking spaces. Persistent parking on Hurst Road is not safe and will potentially cause damage to the greensward.*

*We feel this development would fundamentally change the appearance of Hurst Road and would set a dangerous precedent not only for Hurst Road but the rest of the village where*

*there are numerous large properties where similar development could be proposed. We feel this development would have a significant detrimental effect on the character of the community of Hurst Road and the wider area of Rustington and East Preston and urged the council to refuse permission.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go to the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and will publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Neil Crowther  
Group Head of Planning