

Interested party 3

Comments

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Formal Objection to Planning Appeal (Ref: 6009240)

I write to object to the planning appeal relating to the proposed subdivision of the garden at 94 Marine Crescent to construct a two-bedroom house with access from St John's Avenue.

I live at 10 St John's Avenue, next door but one to the proposed development, and would be directly affected. I fully support Worthing Borough Council's decision to refuse this application.

Character and Design

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of a constrained garden plot and is not in keeping with the established character of St John's Avenue.

St. Johns Avenue is characterised by single-storey bungalows of a consistent and modest design, with a limited number of similar layouts repeated along the road. These properties were originally built to provide ground floor accommodation, creating a strong and coherent streetscape.

The proposed development introduces a two-storey house, which is materially different in scale, form and design. This would appear visually intrusive and out of keeping with the established pattern of development.

This is clearly illustrated in the accompanying annotated plan, which shows that in order to accommodate the proposed building, it must be positioned out of alignment with the established building line, in contrast to the consistent alignment of existing properties. This reinforces the impression of a cramped and incongruous form of development. As shown in the annotated block plan, attached at the end of this letter.

The Council also concluded that the proposal would be an overly cramped and unsympathetic form of infill development, harmful to local character and distinctiveness.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The proposal would have a harmful impact on neighbouring properties.

Due to its proximity, scale and layout, it would result in:

- Increased sense of enclosure
- Loss of outlook
- Potential overlooking from upper-level elements
- Noise and disturbance associated with intensified use

The impact is significant to the adjacent property 8 St Johns Avenue, with a significant loss of light on the south side of this residence. The property currently has the full benefit of unhindered light to this aspect.

The erection of the building as proposed would mean that the back garden and swimming pool of 92 Marine Gardens would be overlooked with a loss of privacy for the occupants

The Council has identified that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring dwellings. No amendments to the scheme have been submitted to address the concerns of the council or the local residents in this appeal.

Traffic and Parking

The proposal introduces a new vehicular access and additional parking onto St John's Avenue.

While modest in scale, it would lead to additional vehicle movements associated with a separate dwelling. On a residential road, even limited increases in traffic and parking demand can affect the character and convenience of the street.

Flood Risk

The site lies within Flood Zone 3, an area of high flood risk.

The Environment Agency previously objected to the application due to the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment, stating that this alone was sufficient reason to refuse planning permission.

Although further information has been submitted, the Council's concerns regarding the appropriateness of new residential development in this location remain valid.

Relevance of Planning Precedent

The Appellant refers to an appeal decision in Saltdean, Brighton in support of this proposal. However, this comparison is not directly relevant.

Planning decisions are site-specific and must be determined on the particular characteristics of the site and its surroundings. The

circumstances in Saltdean differ materially from those at St John's Avenue in terms of layout, established building pattern and character.

Reliance on a single example from a different location does not outweigh the identified harms in this case, and the proposal should be assessed on its own merits.

Conclusion

The proposal:

- Is out of keeping with the established bungalow character of the street
- Represents overdevelopment of a constrained garden plot
- Would harm residential amenity
- Would add to traffic and parking pressures
- Raises significant flood risk concerns

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Inspector dismiss the appeal and uphold the Council's refusal of planning permission.

Yours faithfully

Margaret Shaw [Close](#)