[redacted]

[redacted]

From: Trevor Woodgate [redacted]
Sent: 30 August 2019 14:34
To: Amber Willard <Amber.Willard@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>; Cllr. Hugh Coster [redacted] Cllr. Tony Dixon [redacted] Cllr. Martin Lury [redacted]
Subject: Further Objection to AW/134/19/HH RevA - Two storey extension at 33 Balliol Close, West Meads, Bognor Regis

Dear Amber

As confirmed by Sue Bowley on Wednesday, I understand that there will be no further public speaking on application AW/134/19/HH at the Development Control Committee meeting planned for the 4th September 2019. I understand that this is due to the fact that although it is item 6 on the agenda, the item is listed as a deferred item after a site visit, and as such public speaking will not be happening for it.

I notice since the site visit on the 13th August the developers have submitted a revised set of plans labelled AW/134/19/HH Rev A to the planning portal.
The amendments to the plans involved moving the proposed wall closest to my boundary back 1 metre from it's originally proposed position and the dormer prominence back 1.5 metres from it's originally proposed position.

I feel this revised development will have an overbearing, oppressive and overshadowing effect on my property and is still an over development of the site. As discussed on Wednesday I would therefore like to submit a further objection to the revised plans (word document attached)

I am not sure whether it is the original application that will be discussed at the next DCC meeting or these revised plans. Either way I submit my renewed objection and have cc'd all parties involved in the objections to this application to date, just in case they will be involved in the proceedings on the 4th September.

If any further information becomes available as to what is going to be discussed on the 4th September becomes available to you, I would appreciate you letting me know. Although I will not be able to represent, I do plan to attend the meeting, so that I am as informed as I can be as to what is happening next with this proposed development.

Kind Regards

Trevor Woodgate
7 Downing Close
PO21 5QG



7 Downing Close
Bognor Regis
PO21 5QG

29th August 2019

Dear Sir,

Planning Application Ref: **AW/134/19/HH** (Rev A, submitted 20/8/2019) – Single Storey side and rear extension with rooms in roof, together with porch removal and replacement windows – 33 Balliol Close, West Meads, Bognor Regis.

My property, a three bedroomed bungalow, immediately adjoins the rear boundary of the application site and I consider that my dwelling and garden will be adversely affected by the revised development. I therefore wish to register an objection to the application as submitted.

My reasons for objecting to the revised development are as follows:
The description of the development is misleading in that this is clearly a TWO storey side and rear extension to an existing single storey dwelling. The applicant should be required to amend the description accordingly and the application re-advertised by the Council.
The proposed extension would be very close to the rear boundary of my property and, if permitted and built, would have an oppressive and overbearing effect on the enjoyment of my dwelling and garden. In particular, adverse overshadowing and loss of sunlight to my dwelling and garden. The unsubstantiated "Sunpath" diagrams submitted to the planning portal as evidence that overshadowing won't be an issue are incorrect and misleading. I include an insert using proven solar data (that I have permission to use) to demonstrate as such. I also include some calculations as to how much shadowing my dwelling will receive as a result of this revised extension being built.

I would draw your attention to Policy D DM4 on page 172 of the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031 adopted in July 2018. This policy states, amongst other things, that "When considering applications for extensions and alterations to existing buildings (residential & non-residential) the Council will require that:-

a. the extension or alteration sympathetically relates to and is visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, massing, design, form, scale and materials;
b. the extension or alteration is visually subservient to the main building and provide a high standard of amenity;
c. The extension or alteration does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties;


Developments shall also be consistent with all other Local Plan Policies."

I consider that the revised two storey extension is contrary to the requirements of Policy D DM4 and should therefore be rejected as submitted. A smaller hip-ended extension at a greater distance from the rear boundary and which would lessen the impact on my property may be worthy of consideration. Should planning permission be granted I would request that a condition is imposed requiring no windows or other openings be inserted in the rear elevation of the proposed extension.

The floor space of the property with the revised extension is roughly 210m^2. Given the original property has about 81m^2 of floor space, that translates to an increase of approximately 159%. I consider this substantial increase in floor area to be a gross overdevelopment of the site which, if permitted, could set an undesirable precedent for other substantial extensions to bungalows on the West Meads estate.

Your Faithfully,

Trevor Woodgate




Sunpath diagram listed as 1 January 3pm

This set of unsubstantiated "Sunpath" diagrams are incorrect and misleading and give a false impression that the shadowing cast by this this proposed extension will not really interact with our dwelling. Firstly by choosing times of day favourable to their purpose, and secondly by having incorrect angles of elevation and bearing for those times of day chosen. Correct shadowing calculations using proven solar data, that I have been given permission to use are provided on the next page.

I will now demonstrate that these Sunpath diagrams are incorrect for one diagram, by using the proven solar data for the month of January available at

http://www.timeanddate.com/sun/uk/southampton?month=1&year=2020


For 3pm on 1 January the angle of elevation of the sun is 7°
The height of the dormer is 5.5m
As such we are looking at a shadow triangle that looks like this...



So tan(7°) = 5.5/X therefore X = 5.5/tan(7°) = **44.8m**

Given that the drawings provided in the Sunpath diagram are suggesting a shadow of about 23m in length, this drawing is suggesting the sun is at an angle of evelation almost twice that it is in reality (an angle of elevation the sun barely reaches at it's meridian this time of year). The bearing of the shadow is off too. All the diagrams suffer from these issues


As such these diagrams cannot be used as reliable evidence of the shadowing the proposed development will cast on our dwelling




X = SQRT(16895*16895)+(5200*5200)) = 17677

Y = SQRT((16895*16895)+(9400*9400)) = 19334

Extension is roughly 5.5m high, so an elevation of approximately 4.5m from our windows.



tan(e1) = 4500/ 17677
e1 = 14.28°



tan(e2)=4500/ 19334
e2 = 13.1°

using measurements from the front of my house so as to place myself at the red cross, and a compass I was able to determine angle a is at a bearing of 233°
and angle b is at a bearing of 280°

Using sunrise and sunset data from
http://www.timeanddate.com/sun/uk/southampton?month=9&year=2019 and
http://www.timeanddate.com/sun/uk/southampton?month=3&year=2019
it can be determined that the dormer prominence at 250° bearing and an angle of elevation of 13°, imposes the most shadowing. Expanding the sun's path for the days in these months shows that from the 28th September to the 15 March, the suns angle of elevation is such that the dormer prominence will cast a shadow **within** our dwelling.

Thus demonstrating we will experience shadowing within our dwelling 166 days in the year as a result of the proposed extension