

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 30/12/2025 2:05 PM from Mr Kevin Page.

Application Summary

Address: 94 Marine Crescent Worthing West Sussex BN12 4JH

Proposal: Subdivision of existing dwelling plot to provide 2 bedroom chalet bungalow style detached house in rear garden with parking accessed off St John's Avenue

Case Officer: Jo Morin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Kevin Page

Email:

Address: 12 St Johns Avenue Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: FORMAL OBJECTION - PLANNING POLICY GROUNDS

Application: 94 Marine Crescent, Worthing BN12 4JH

Proposal: Subdivision of existing dwelling plot to provide a 2-bedroom chalet bungalow style dwelling

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write to object to the above application on behalf of the occupiers of No. 12 St John's Avenue, on the basis that the proposal conflicts with the Adur & Worthing Local Plan (2014) and would result in material harm to the character of the area, neighbouring amenity, and highway safety.

1. Conflict with Character and Design Policies (AWLP Policies CP12 & QD14)

Policy CP12 (Urban Design) requires development to:

- Respond positively to local character

- Respect scale, massing, layout and height
- Reinforce the distinctive character of neighbourhoods

Policy QD14 (Extensions and Alterations) similarly seeks development that is:

- In keeping with surrounding buildings
- Not visually intrusive or dominant

Despite being described as a "chalet bungalow", the proposal constitutes a two-storey dwelling in form, scale and impact. The height, bulk and roof mass are incongruous within a streetscape defined by single-storey bungalows, resulting in a visually dominant and discordant form of development.

The proposal therefore fails to respect the established built form, contrary to Policies CP12 and QD14.

2. Inappropriate Scale, Projection and Building Line (AWLP Policies CP12 & QD14)

The proposed dwelling would project forward of the established building line by approximately one third of the depth of the adjacent bungalow at No. 8, representing a significant and uncharacteristic departure from the consistent alignment of surrounding properties.

This forward projection would have a cascading visual and spatial impact on neighbouring dwellings at Nos. 10, 12 and 14, and on properties further along the avenue, where the proposal would intrude into established sightlines and introduce a prominent built form where none currently exists. The result would be an unbalanced and visually intrusive development, interrupting the rhythm, spacing and openness characteristic of the street.

The degree of projection and associated massing would also contribute to an obstructive and enclosing effect, exacerbating the perceived scale of the development and reinforcing its out-of-character appearance. This conflicts with Policy CP12, which requires development to respect established plot patterns and building lines, and Policy QD14, which seeks to avoid visually dominant or intrusive forms of development.

3. Unacceptable Impact on Residential Amenity (AWLP Policy QD27)

Policy QD27 (Protection of Amenity) seeks to prevent development that results in:

- Loss of daylight or sunlight
- Overbearing impact
- Loss of privacy or outlook

The proposed height, siting and proximity would cause:

- Loss of daylight, particularly to bungalows along St John's Avenue
- An overbearing sense of enclosure to neighbouring bungalows
- Overlooking and loss of privacy affecting existing dwellings along St John's Avenue

These impacts are material and harmful, failing the requirements of Policy QD27.

4. Overdevelopment and Inappropriate Back-Land Development (AWLP Policies CP1 & CP12)

Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) and CP12 require development to make efficient use of land without compromising character or amenity.

The subdivision of a rear garden to accommodate a detached dwelling of this scale represents cramped back-land development, which:

- Fails to provide adequate separation distances
- Leaves insufficient space for landscaping or mitigation
- Results in an intensive and incongruous form of development

The proposal therefore constitutes overdevelopment of the site, contrary to Policies CP1 and CP12.

5. Highway Safety and Access Concerns (AWLP Policy CP33)

Policy CP33 (Transport and Accessibility) requires development to:

- Ensure safe and suitable access
- Avoid highway danger
- Not result in unacceptable impacts on the local road network

The proposal relies on access via St John's Avenue, close to a Y-junction, where:

- Visibility is constrained
- Traffic movements are already sensitive
- Construction and servicing vehicles would create conflict

The intensification of vehicle movements, both during construction and occupation, raises legitimate highway safety concerns, contrary to Policy CP33.

It is also noted that the existing dwelling at 94 Marine Crescent does not front St John's Avenue, whereas the proposed access, parking arrangements and the majority of construction and servicing activity would take place directly adjacent to homes on St John's Avenue. As a result, the impacts of the development - including noise, disturbance, traffic movements and visual effects, would fall disproportionately on residents of St John's Avenue, who currently experience a quiet residential environment.

6. Construction Impact on a Quiet Residential Area (AWLP Policy QD27)

While temporary, the scale and duration of construction associated with this proposal would cause prolonged disturbance through:

- Noise, vibration and dust
- Heavy goods vehicles and skips
- Potential damage to footways and kerbs

In a quiet, low-density residential area largely occupied by long-term residents, this further compounds harm to amenity under Policy QD27.

7. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The proposal conflicts with:

- NPPF Paragraph 130, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and avoid overdevelopment
- NPPF Paragraph 135, which allows refusal where design fails to improve the quality of the area

Conclusion

Taken as a whole, the proposal:

- Fails to respect local character and established building lines
- Causes material harm to neighbouring amenity
- Represents an overdevelopment of a back-land plot
- Raises highway safety concerns

It is therefore contrary to the Adur & Worthing Local Plan and the NPPF and should be refused.

Yours faithfully,
Kevin Page
12 St Johns Avenue
