

Saffron Lodge, 46 Kingsway
Craigweil, Bognor Regis
West Sussex, PO21 4DN

My Ref: AW/267/15/HH-1

14th October 2015

The Head of Planning Services
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road
Littlehampton, West Sussex
BN17 5LF
FAO Head of Planning Services

BY EMAIL

Dear Sirs

Ref: **OBJECTION : AW/267/15/HH (68 The Drive, Craigweil)**

Having studied the papers for the above Application, I wish to **OBJECT** on several grounds.

Following thorough inspection of the Agent's documents, I am very puzzled and concerned **at the contradictions** contained in the details.

1. In a letter to the Council dated 27th August last, addressing AW/261/15/DOC, a Mr Mustion from Philips Surveyors says in response to meeting Condition 5 of the AW/344/14/HH Permission and I quote " I would like to confirm that the... The east terrace screening for privacy will be dealt with by way of raising the height of the existing parapet up to 1.8m **using insulated blockwork and rendered.**" Having spoken to the neighbours at No 70 The Drive, this alteration to solid, rendered blockwork is seen as a benefit to them, HOWEVER, in the plans **now before us** under AW/267/15/HH, that terrace is detailed as previously agreed in stainless steel with opaque glass panels. This plan was submitted to the District only 8 days after the statement that blockwork will be used. **So what is it we have proposed, is it glazed steel frames OR rendered blockwork??** These contradictory statement appears **FIVE TIMES** in the Design and Access Statement from the Agents Messrs. Philips. I have responded separately on this matter to the Council under AW/261/15/DOC, **but I consider it relevant to this current full Application AW/267/15/HH.**

2. Further now however, in the light of the privacy of both houses, **I fail to see the necessity of a balcony to the east side at all,** as the proposed balcony situated on the north-east of the building, will only receive sunlight in the early morning and gives no access to the garden below. **Its omission from a new house design will solve greatly the privacy issues with the occupants of No.70 The Drive, as their main bedroom is only feet away.**

I now turn to POLICY matters.

3. All these factors concerning the proposals for replacing the existing side access to the east I still maintain must be **an unneighbourly and unacceptable intrusion** upon the residents of No.70 The Drive.

4. POLICY DEV 19(iii) '**the extension does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties**' must surely be **called into question** therefore. Para(v) '**the extension does not compromise the established**

special character and pattern of the street' is also relevant to this development and the plans do not meet these requirements.

5. Policy GEN 7(para(iv) 'does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers, land, uses or property.....'and at (v) takes account of any unacceptable adverse impacts that may arise from adjoining land uses or property' similarly are not complied with in these plans.

6. The CHCA is also classified as 'An Area of Special Character' (ASC). I now turn to POLICY AREA 1, Areas of Special Character, within Section 2- Area Policies. Under (iii) of the above, the Policy states "permission will be granted subject to - the development makes a positive contribution to the special character of these areas". There is no such positive contribution here. With the proposed GREY wall claddings, the new design will completely change the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and pays no heed to the buildings in the near vicinity. To marry the surrounding properties, the proposed **bright steel and reflective glass panelling** to balconies contrasts adversely and unacceptably. There are many other materials **that do not risk reflective characteristics** that would be far more conducive and complimentary to the Conservation Area Statement requirements.

7. We must be asking ourselves, national guidelines require proof that changes in Conservation Areas MUST not harm but improve their character and appearance and does this action enhance what we have? Even though we are dealing here with a relatively late dated house in historical terms, the house has its own distinct character of that period. These plans are not preserving nor enhancing what exists now in terms of open aspects between property. The plans will 'close in' upon a neighbour and still considerably reduce their privacy.

8. Returning to National and District Policies, Arun DC's Supplementary Planning Guidance at para 1.2 calls attention to Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990, stating "**Conservation Areas are statutorily defined as "areas of special architectural or historical interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance."**".

9. At para 1.4 it says '**The principle of conservation is to protect and preserve those buildings, features, spaces, activities and uses which form the particular character and appearance of an area, whilst allowing for appropriate change and new development which preserves or enhances that special character.'**

10. Originally, on the other side of the twitten leading to the beach from the application site is one of the original 1930's DuCros houses named 'The Cottage' (No.66). That house is on Arun's Local List of Buildings and stands in all its glory, a complete contrast to the new work planned for next door. To 'upgrade' in the manners suggested for No.68 further puts this original DuCros property at risk, taking away its surrounding defences should it too become the subject of new purchase and change for changes sake in the future. The stainless steel and glazed panelling to the west and south of the FIRST FLOOR of the Application property, with the sun from NOON onwards, will suffer reflections from these materials to that property's detriment **and to the property's occupants.—a local listed house of character!!**. The erosion of what we have here is gradual but none the less effective toward destroying the very character of what exists at Craigweil.

11. Similarly, with the proposed GREY Marley Eternit weatherboarding, this will directly face this original red/brown character property at No.66, completely out of context and an incongruous intrusion into the street scene.

12. I am pleased to see that the local Parish Council at Aldwick recognise the problems here and register an **OBJECTION (opposing it)** for clarity. They too are seeking information as to exactly what is proposed for the eastern terrace/balcony.

For all the reasons outlined above, especially those relating to Arun DC's own Policy Statements, **please REFUSE this Application.**

Yours faithfully



CC Martyn White, ADC.Conservation Officer
& Councillor Mrs G.Brown, Ward Councillor