

Rumford House
Church Road,
Yapton
Arundel,
West Sussex BN18 0EW

Amber Willard
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Maltravers Street
Littlehampton

25th April 2022

**ref Y/36/22/HH – Erection of detached workshop, gym/hobby and greenhouse at
Berri Court, Main Road, Yapton BN18 0ED**

Dear Ms Willard

My property (Rumford House) is next to Berri Court, whose owner, Mr Mike Harding, has applied for planning permission to erect three structures in his garden, namely a greenhouse, a workshop and a gym/hobby room. The application is made on the basis of all three being built immediately adjacent to the boundary wall which separates our respective properties, extending to the major length of it.

I would like to register a number of concerns about this application as submitted.

1. The Heritage Design and Access Statement is extraordinarily brief. However, at point (b) in the Introduction, it states that

'The proposal considers the amenity of the adjoining neighbours as demonstrated within this document and application drawings'.

This is misleading. The overall site plan submitted (Drawing No.1 Rev D) is out of date. In relation to Rumford House, it shows neither the conservatory erected in 2002, nor the one-story extension to the house built in 2013. As a consequence, the plan gives a false impression of the amenity space available at Rumford, particularly to the south and west. The structures proposed under this application are located close to the southern and western boundaries of my property. The proposed gym/hobby room and workshop buildings are both higher than the existing boundary wall. Their locations and height will result in over-dominant structures that will hem in and adversely affect the amenity value of the main private amenity space of Rumford.

In view of this, I have asked the Planning Officer to visit Rumford House to properly assess the impact of this proposal on my property as part of the consideration of this application and before it is determined.

2. The application is short of a Tree Report and no trees are shown on the site plan. There is one large tree in close proximity to the proposed Gym/hobby room but this is not shown on the plan. Prior to the submission of this application, there has been some considerable clearing of trees and shrubbery.

3. Berri Court is a distinguished-looking listed building. It falls within the Conservation area (Main Road/Church Lane, Yapton) designated in 1994. Whilst the proposed design of the greenhouse could be regarded as sympathetic, the workshop and gym/hobby room could not be described as being neutral to, let alone enhancing, the character and appearance of the property and its grounds.
4. The heights of the structures proposed exceed the height of the existing boundary wall. In particular, as planned, the workshop would be directly in the line of sight from my conservatory and patio area. Quite apart from aesthetic considerations, it would reduce the amount of natural light to my garden.

Could the option to re-site the workshop (against the boundary with the surgery car park for instance) be explored? If not, would it be possible to reduce the height of the proposed workshop or relocate further away from the flint wall, such that at least no black painted timber cladding was visible from my property?

5. While I presume that that planning permission would be restricted to ancillary use to the main house, there is nevertheless the more serious and intrusive issue of potential noise from the workshop and the gym/hobby room and, additionally, possible air/odour pollution from the uses carried out in the workshop.

I hope that some revisions could be made to Mr Harding's proposal to avoid the adverse effects which would result for me, as his immediate neighbour but, as submitted, I would urge you to reject it.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Brearley-Smith