

Interested party 2

Comments

Appeal Representation / Objection Letter

LAND AT: 94 Marine Crescent, Worthing, West Sussex, BN12 4JH

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: 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

APPLICATION REFERENCE: AWDM/1520/25

PLANNING INSPECTORATE NUMBER: 6009240

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write to strongly object to the above planning appeal and support the Council's original decision to refuse planning permission.

Having reviewed the appellant's Statement of Case, I respectfully submit that the appeal should be dismissed as the proposal would continue to result in material harm to the character, openness and residential amenity of St John's Avenue and the surrounding area, consistent with the Council's refusal reasons under Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's Residential Development SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").

1. Harm to Character and Spatial Pattern

Historically, St John's Avenue was laid out as a spacious bungalow development with consistent building setbacks, open frontages, landscaped verges, low boundary walls and generous spacing contributing to a coherent and distinctive character.

Whilst some neighbouring bungalows incorporate steeply pitched roofs, the prevailing character remains one of modest bungalow-scale development with accommodation principally

accommodated at ground-floor level. The proposed chalet dwelling would materially depart from this established character through its increased roof height, visual massing and substantial forward projection beyond the established building line.

The proposal would therefore appear cramped, contrived and visually discordant within the streetscene, precisely as identified by the Council in Refusal Reason 1. (Refer to Appendix 1: Photos).

2. Increased Enclosure and Erosion of Openness

Recent alterations to the site boundary have already materially changed the character and openness of this part of St John's Avenue. Historically, low boundary walls contributed to an open and spacious bungalow setting. However, the recent erection of a substantially taller timber fence and concrete posts has increased enclosure and interrupted the visual openness previously experienced between neighbouring properties. (Refer to Appendix 1: Photos).

This change has caused significant concern amongst neighbouring residents and has materially altered the appearance and openness of the immediate streetscene. The proposed chalet dwelling would further intensify this harmful change through the introduction of a taller and visually dominant built form immediately behind the altered boundary treatment.

The cumulative impact of the taller boundary treatment together with the proposed dwelling would materially reduce the openness presently experienced along this part of St John's Avenue and create an overbearing and enclosed form of development inconsistent with the established spatial character of the avenue.

The proposal would also interrupt the open visual outlook presently experienced from neighbouring properties through the introduction of a prominent elevated roof form where openness currently exists.

3. Residential Amenity Impacts

The appellant seeks to focus primarily on overlooking and direct

sunlight calculations. However, the Council's refusal reason correctly identified broader harm arising from the proposal's height, scale, massing, roof form, orientation and visual prominence.

The cumulative effect of the increased roof height, forward projection and visual dominance would materially reduce the sense of openness currently experienced by neighbouring residents and create a harmful and intrusive relationship with neighbouring bungalows along St John's Avenue.

Particular concern also remains regarding the increased roof height and forward projection adjacent to neighbouring bungalows, especially No. 8 St John's Avenue, where the proposal would introduce a materially taller and more dominant built form beyond the established building line.

4. Appeal Comparisons and Precedents

The appellant places significant reliance upon other developments and the Lustrells Crescent appeal decision. However, appeal decisions are site-specific and are not binding precedents.

The present appeal site has materially different characteristics, including its relationship with neighbouring bungalows, the impact on the established building line and the resulting visual prominence when viewed from St John's Avenue.

The appellant also refers to taller buildings elsewhere in the wider area, including flats and chalet forms. However, the immediate relationship of the proposal is principally with neighbouring bungalows along St John's Avenue and would therefore be experienced primarily within a low-rise bungalow context. (Refer to Appendix 1: Photos).

The Inspector must therefore determine this appeal on its own planning merits.

Conclusion

The proposal would:

- create a cramped and visually intrusive form of infill

development,

- erode the openness and bungalow character of St John's Avenue,
- increase enclosure and visual dominance,
- and cause material harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

The appellant's Statement of Case does not overcome the Council's well-founded refusal reasons.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the appeal be dismissed.

Yours faithfully,

Kevin Page
12 St. Johns Avenue











