

Rumford House
Church Road
Yapton
Arundel
West Sussex BN18 0EW

Hannah Kersley
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Maltravers Street
Littlehampton

3rd July 2022

Ref Y/68/22/L and Y/67/22/HH

Dear Ms Kersley

I hope it is acceptable to address my comments on the above two applications in this one letter. As far as I can see, the applications are identical, both amended versions of application Y/36/22/HH which was withdrawn in May 2022.

The new applications appear to have responded, but only in small part, to the comments raised in my letter objecting to Y/36/22/HH, including -

- correctly showing the existing footprint to my property (Rumford House) and
- moving the proposed new structures (workshop, gym/hobby room and greenhouse) slightly further away from the boundary between our respective properties by a distance of between 31cm and 75.9cm.

I still have a number of concerns about the current applications.

1. Neither application appears to have included a Tree Report. (My understanding is that the Arun Tree Officer requested one for the previous application). The Site Plans still do not show the location of trees closest to the proposed structures.

2. The Heritage Statement – Design and Access Statement remains unchanged from the earlier application. This is inadequate and lacks important details, as follows;

- the historical evolution of Berri Court, including the development of Rumford House and Eucalypus House in its grounds
- the effects of the proposed scheme on the setting of Berri Court and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- consideration of alternative locations for the proposed structures, and an explanation as to why the locations, as submitted, were chosen (as against behind the surgery car park for example).

3. There is no sectional plan which shows the existing house (Berri Court) with the proposed workshop and greenhouse, together with neighbouring properties (Rumford House and Eucalyptus House) to illustrate the overall context.

4. The re-siting of the proposed structures away from the boundary wall could be improved by moving both the workshop and the gym/hobby room a minimum of 2.6m away from the boundary wall, as per the proposed greenhouse which is lower in height and

lighter in construction compared with them; but, again, I would question why it is proposed that all three structures are concentrated against the one boundary between our respective properties and all in proximity to my house.

5. As stated in my response to the previous application (Y/36/22/HH) Berri Court is a distinguished-looking listed building. It falls within the Conservation Area (Main Road/Church Lane, Yapton) as designated in 1994. While the proposed design of the greenhouse could be regarded as sympathetic, the workshop and gym/hobby room could not be described as neutral to, let alone enhancing, the character and appearance of the property and its grounds.

6. Also stated previously, and still not addressed, is that while I presume that planning permission would be restricted to ancillary use to the main house, there is nevertheless the much more serious and intrusive issue of noise from the workshop and gym/hobby room and, additionally, possible pollution from the workshop.

These applications do not avoid the adverse affects which would result for me, as Mr Harding's immediate neighbour and, as such, I would urge you to reject it.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Brearley-Smith