

10<sup>th</sup> February 2015

Mr D Easton  
Case Officer  
Arun District Council

Dear Mr Easton,

**Re Planning Application No. AW/344/14/HH - 68 The Drive, Craigweil**

As owners of the neighbouring house we wish to register our objections to the above plans as follows:

**1. New external steps at rear of side extension and associated "Terrace" as indicated on Document 68/2014/30P Rev. B and Document 68/2014/60P Rev. A**

The house is an "upside down" house and the existing arrangement has a main staircase on the outside of the rear elevation from the first floor to the garden, plus secondary outside stairs on the eastern elevation to ground level. The stairs on the eastern elevation are close to the boundary with our house and overlook our bedroom.

The plans provide for the main external staircase at the rear to be dispensed with, thus making the stairs on the eastern elevation the only external access from the first floor. It is reasonable to assume therefore that this would generate a doubling of traffic on those steps from which we have already experienced significant noise intrusion with loud phone conversations being conducted on the staircase. The plans seem to provide for what is termed a "terrace" on the first floor eastern elevation. The proposed terrace is both wider and longer than the current access to the steps and seems to us to have been designed to accommodate a degree of external living. It would appear to have potential for the noise level to increase and for even greater intrusion into our privacy. It is certainly a change of use from the existing arrangement.

We must question whether any external access from the first floor to the ground floor is an essential. If, for safety reasons and not just reasons of convenience, the answer is that it is essential, we would suggest that the stairs be retained on the middle of the rear elevation where they are currently and where they cause the least invasion of privacy to any neighbours. There would be no need for additional stairs on the eastern wall in that case.

**2. Gable Roof to existing first floor living room extension**

No. 68 was built such that much of the house lies beyond the rear elevation of our property. The proposed gable will increase the spread of the roof height reducing the amount of mid/late afternoon sunlight that we currently enjoy in the garden as the sun moves westward in the sky. The proposal of a gabled roof can only be for cosmetic reasons; the house has existed without problem all these years with a flat roof over the first floor living room extension. The gabled roof is not a necessity and would disadvantage us in terms of being able to enjoy afternoon sun in our garden.

**3. Outside Swimming Pool**

We have not studied the measurements of the site of the proposed swimming pool, but in any event, these are subject to the accuracy or otherwise of the builder. The plan as it stands is to place the pool beside our boundary wall. The excavating for a swimming pool has the potential to interfere with the footings of that boundary wall, the roots of our mature trees and shrubs, and

might also impact on the remaining section of flint wall from the original Craigweil House which is part of our beach terrace where King George used to walk during his convalescence at Craigweil.

**4. Display of the Notice of the Planning Application**

Whether accidental or intentional – we would hope the former - it was extremely unhelpful that the Planning Notice was displayed immediately after a previous notice about tree-works on the property. Everyone who passed by observed and read the tree-works notice so when the planning notice was put up in the same place, everyone believed it still to be the tree-works notice. Of the people I have spoken to in the past few days, none of them were aware that a planning application had been submitted. I only discovered it myself because Aldwick Parish Council put a note through my door two days before their meeting to consider it. Had other neighbours been aware of it they might have wanted to raise their own objections.

These are the points on which we base our objections. However, may we also say that it is a great shame that prospective newcomers to this conservation area appear to be purchasing properties, particularly beach side properties, purely for location, with the intention of significantly altering the appearance of the property irrespective of whether the changes are sympathetic to the character and appearance of this historic estate. We already have a property on our eastern boundary which is out of character with all the other properties around and we really do not wish to be bordered on both sides by unsuitably “modern” facades. As long-standing residents since 1986 we should not be disadvantaged by newcomers to the estate.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Fraser

Robert Fraser