

Appeal Representation/Objection Letter

Land at: 94 Marine Crescent, Worthing BN12 4JH

Application Reference AWDM/1520/25

Planning Inspectorate Number 6009240

Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing to strongly object to the above planning appeal and to fully support the Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

This letter is in addition to our original objection letter

We have reviewed the appellant's Statement of Case and respectfully ask for the appeal to be dismissed as it would result in harm to the openness and residential amenity of St Johns Avenue particularly in relation to our property at No8 St Johns Avenue which will suffer the most impact from this proposal.

Please see **attached photographs** including our property 8 St Johns Ave in relation to the appeal

This very close proximity and the proposed new build line would result in an overwhelming loss of light to our everyday living areas (a total of 5 windows) resulting in an unacceptable harmful impact to us. (**See fig1**) The proposal would further increase enclosure and erode the openness which has already been materially changed by the recent construction of a concrete post fence, substantially higher than our existing low level boundary wall. Images of this are not clearly shown in the appellants' statement. (**See fig 2**)

Photographs

We have particular concern over Appendix B in the appellants Statement: Site photographs. We find theses photographs fall far short of illustrating the very negative impact the proposal would have on our property at No8 and the wider area of St Johns Avenue.

The appellant states: "the photographs demonstrate that the proposed plot is spacious and open" and "well separated from neighbouring properties" However this is clearly not the case when considering our property (**See fig 3**) fig3and that of our neighbours at No92 Marine Crescent. The proposed 2 storey building would be constructed very close to our property (closer than any other existing buildings are in the Avenue) and extend well beyond the

build line of ours and the other bungalows in St Johns Ave. Indeed, the proposal is only able to “fit” in the plot by extending so far forward into St Johns Avenue due to limited and cramped space to the rear of the plot.

We have several concerns/criticisms regarding the appellants listed photographs and related comments, we believe they lack detail and that some are taken from misleading viewpoints and using wide angle lenses creating a distorted representation of the proposal, space and how the proposal sits in the immediate area.

Clearly the photos listed in the appellants Statement show very little of No8, and do not clearly represent just how discordant this 2- storey dwelling would be in its effect to our property or the wider area of St Johns Avenue.

Please see **attached photographs** including our property 8 St Johns Ave in relation to the proposal

Our comments on the appellants photographs are as follows;

Image1 The removal of the wall and lawn areas illustrate how far the proposal would have to extend into St Johns Avenue well beyond the rear garden boundary wall of No 92 (**See fig 4**)

Image 2 This shows just one window (out of 5) at No8 that would be almost totally obscured

Image 3 We feel this image does not fully represent how much the road narrows beyond the junction and is taken some distance away from the appeal site (**See fig 5**)

Image 4 This photograph taken from considerable height and does consider/ mention the boundary to No8 along which the proposed 2 storey building will run and gives a false impression of the size of the proposed building plot site. (**See fig 6**)

Image 5 This property is on the opposite side to No8 it is long established and does not extend beyond the build line of any neighbouring bungalows. Note the generous distance between the 2 properties. The proposal does not consider this distance in relation to our property at all

Image 6 This image shows flats and bungalows set back from the street with low level boundary walls and generous spacing between properties, very much unlike the proposal.

Image 7 We disagree that this shows a chalet bungalow with a single storey next to it but rather two bungalows. The left has no upper living space or balcony. Note low boundary walls, no higher fence and adequate spacing between

Image 8/9 None of these photos include our property, No8, and while they show a variety of building shape, they fail to acknowledge how the proposal will sit alongside our property or within the openness of St Johns Avenue. We find the term “bookend” is particularly inconsiderate and insensitive to all residents in St Johns Avenue

The appellant also places significant reference to the Lustrells Crescent appeal decision. The current appeal site is very different in its location and its impact on our property and the surrounding bungalows in St Johns Avenue must be considered on its own merits. Appeal decisions are not binding precedents but site specific and the Inspector should decide this appeal as an individual planning case.

In conclusion we fully support the Councils’ decision to refuse planning permission and believe the proposal would:

- Create a cramped and visually intrusive form of infill development
- Erode the openness and bungalow character of St Johns Avenue
- Increase enclosure and visual dominance
- Cause material harm through loss of light, privacy and residential amenity

We do not feel the appellants Statement of Case outweighs the Council’s reasons for refusing planning permission

We respectfully ask that the appeal be dismissed

Yours faithfully

Rachel Richards

Stef Zaninetti

8 St Johns Avenue