Further Representation – Planning Application [AWDM/0453/25]

Dear Louise,

I write to submit additional comments in relation to the above planning application, reinforcing and expanding upon my previous objection.

I wish to note at the outset that my initial representation was submitted under considerable time pressure. The original consultation letter was dated some time before it reached me by post, leaving me with significantly less time to respond than the process intends. As a result, my previous comments were necessarily brief and I was unable to address all of my concerns fully. I ask that the LPA gives due weight to these additional representations accordingly.

1. Parking and Access Pressure

I note the response from the Local Highway Authority (WSCC, dated 06/08/2025) which acknowledges that under WSCC Parking Standards, a dwelling of this size and location would ordinarily be expected to provide two car parking spaces. The proposal makes no provision for any off-street parking whatsoever, and the Highway Authority concedes that vehicular parking would therefore have to be accommodated on-street. Notably, the Highway Authority explicitly invites the Local Planning Authority to consider the impact of this on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.

I urge the LPA to take that concern seriously. Russell Close already operates under significant parking pressure (see appendix below). We have vehicles regularly parked along extended stretches of the road, narrowing its effective width and creating difficulties for residents, pedestrians, and service vehicles alike. The junction with Harrison Road is a particular concern, where parked vehicles already restrict visibility and makes turning in to/out of the close difficult. Children play within the street environment and reduced visibility caused by parked vehicles creates a hazardous situation. Elderly residents and those with prams already experience difficulty accessing the pavement safely due to obstructed or narrowed pedestrian space.

The addition of a further household with no dedicated parking whatsoever will displace further vehicles onto a street that has no ability to absorb them. This is not a theoretical risk but a predictable and demonstrable impact on the amenity of existing residents.

The Highway Authority's conclusion that this would not cause a severe highway safety impact reflects the high legal threshold set by the NPPF. However, the planning balance for the LPA is broader than that threshold alone. The failure to meet adopted parking standards, combined with existing on-street pressure, represents a material amenity concern. I respectfully request that the LPA gives this significant weight in its determination.

2. Design and Visual Appearance

As previously mentioned, I am concerned that the proposal fails to demonstrate with any certainty that the finished dwelling will be visually consistent with the existing character of Russell Close. Whilst the submitted elevations suggest an intention to match the appearance of the neighbouring property, no binding materials specification has been provided. There is no guarantee that the applicant will be able to source materials that genuinely match the existing streetscene in terms of brick colour, tone, texture or roof tile appearance.

Furthermore, the ground floor front elevation windows proposed for 21A appear to differ noticeably from those of the adjoining property No. 21, and from the established window patterns visible throughout Russell Close (see appendix below). All existing dwellings on

Russell Close follow a consistent pattern of a single ground floor window to one side of the front door. The proposed front elevation of 21A departs from this established pattern by introducing two ground floor windows, a feature found nowhere else on the close. This would result in a dwelling that is visibly out of character with the uniform streetscene, contrary to the requirement under NPPF paragraph 135 that new development be sympathetically designed and visually integrated with its surroundings.

This matters because Russell Close has a consistent and established character. The introduction of a visibly mismatched end-of-terrace dwelling (even one of an appropriate scale) would cause lasting harm to the appearance of the street that cannot easily be undone once built.

Therefore, I would ask that the LPA does not rely on a standard materials condition alone. Given the sensitivity of the location and the prominence of the end-of-terrace position, I request that any approval requires the submission and physical approval of a sample materials panel prior to construction commencing, ensuring that materials are verified on site rather than approved in principle only.

I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses this application or at minimum does not determine it until a full assessment of on-street parking amenity, a binding materials specification and the impact on neighbouring amenity have been properly considered and addressed.

Yours Sincerely,
R. Jones

Appendix A - Street Parking on Russell Close surrounding/close to proposed 21A (my own photos) Green arrow is 21 Russell Close







Image of Harrison Road that shows parking



Angle facing into Russell Close shows cars parked up to the corner which makes it incredibly challenging to see when coming in/out of road.

Appendix B - Streetscene Character [Google Street View/Zoopla showing consistent single ground floor window pattern across all dwellings on Russell Close]:



Block No.1-5 Russell Close (as of June 2024)



Block No.7-11 Russell Close (as of June 2024)



Off-market

19 Russell Close, Worthing, BN14 8LR

Mid terrace house 3 beds 1 bath 1 reception Edit

No. 19 and 20 Russell Close (as of May 2023) used due to lack of accessibility for Google Streetview Vehicle