
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 February 2022 13:39
To: Amber Willard <Amber.Willard@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>; Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>; Richard Ostler [REDACTED] Daniel Vick <Daniel.Vick@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Fw: 1-54 The Drive - AW-413-21 -12-2-2022 - OBJECTION.
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 19, 2022 10:35 PM
To: [Arun Planning](#) ; [Amber Willard](#) ; [Neil Crowther](#) ; [Daniel Vick](#) ; [Richard Ostler](#)
Subject: 1-54 The Drive - AW-413-21 -12-2-2022 - OBJECTION.

**Richard Ostler
'Silvergates'
52 The Drive
Aldwick
Bognor Regis
PO21 4DT**



54 The Drive – AW-413-21-HH – 12-2-2022

Group Head of Planning
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

12 February 2022

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Sir,

**OBJECTION – AW-413-21-HH – 54 The Drive –
'Upward extension to first floor level of single storey (west wing) and forward
extension to create entrance porch' next to a Grade 2 Listed Building at No.52 and
all within the Craigweil House Conservation Area**

INTRODUCTION

This planning application, in my view, is extensively flawed, inaccurate and misleading in its content and omissions to the extent that it is seen as being a deceiving document deliberately designed and intended to misrepresent many aspects of significance. Indeed, this application is totally unique in that it leaves us with no alternative but to deal with flawed issues and not, merely, the application detail as is the normal process.

The writer knows this property, from the footings upwards, since consent was granted for he has lived at No. 52 since 1978 – 43 years. The claim of the applicant that the house at 54 The Drive was built in 1972 is incorrect. The application to build 54 was 'Approved Conditionally' on the 23 August 1978 by Bognor Regis Urban District Council under reference BR/572/78. Consent to build upon the land followed the demolition of 'Thatchings' - an extensive and significant structure of a historic, thatched home owned by Guys Hospital in London and used for Rest and Recuperation of its staff. There were no short flights to France, Portugal or Spain in those days and the virtually 'family hospital' 'holiday R & R home' embraced stables and kept horses for hospital staff to on the Craigweil and Pagham beaches. Following its demolition by local developers, four houses, numbered 54 to 60, claimed to be of Mediterranean style, were built there.

COMMENT UPON 'DESIGN & ACCESS AND HERITAGE STATEMENT'

This is seen as being a sadly inadequate document, indicating a total lack of knowledge of the area, when the applicant says on line one *'The Craigwell Estate is a private estate set along a short stretch of coastline, geographically between Aldwick village (wherever that is thought to be) and Pagham'*. The applicant continues, inter alia with phrases such as **'Historically in terms of context...'** and, elsewhere, of **'Evaluation of contextual scale...'**. After more than 40 years in civil engineering, I say that this is meaningless drivel and twaddle.

Throughout this document and the application, the applicant, who lives here, speaks of **'CRAIGWELL'** when the correct, ancient name is **'CRAIGWEIL'** and well he should know this if he or his agent have researched to historical assets of the area.

The momentous and unique *'short sea-side respite'* was, in accurate and respectful terminology, as quoted by the LPA and was a three month recuperation stay at Craigweil House of King George the Fifth with Queen Mary. This is dismissed by saying only *'...King George V stayed for a short sea-side respite'*. This is inaccurate, disrespectful and insulting BUT IS NOT A PLANNING MATTER and simply reflects the lack of knowledge of the area in which the applicant wishes to build WITHOUT appreciation of the Regal and planning significance which conflicts heavily with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031(LP) and, particularly, the Craigweil House Conservation Area Statement which it subordinates in a grossly disrespectful manner by simply ignoring its existence and content and failing to comply with the planning Law within the Local Plan.

Bognor Town was granted the dignity of 'Regis' and, from the visits of the Royalty of Europe and British Royal and other dignitaries - all matters of consideration under the NPPF - became known as the 'Centre of Europe' - as, indeed, it was - an area of England steeped in Regal history as was no other, including Buckingham Palace.

Paragraph 2 goes on to assert that *'...the applicant proposal is relevant in terms of its context and relationship to its adjacent Listed Building;'* - whatever that means! It goes on to say *'The application site is to a degree screened from the adjacent dwelling by boundary landscaping'*. **This claim is completely untrue for, between the boundary fence separating 52 and 54 is no more than a concrete footpath 2M (6' 6") wide. THERE WILL THEN BE BUILT AN ALREADY APPROVED BALCONY which will PROJECT SOUTH ENABLING A DIRECT VIEW INTO Mrs.Ostler's DRESSING AND CHANGING ROOM - THE MOST PRIVATE ROOM OF ANY HOUSE.**

CURTAINS ARE ALREADY PERMANENTLY DRAWN BUT PRIVACY TO THE BEDROOM IS STILL BREACHED. The claim of there being a 'boundary screened by landscaping' is no more than a false statement FOR ONLY concrete is there - not even a blade of glass. WE HAVE HAD TO BUY WOODLAND TREES TO EXCLUDE SOME INWARD VIEWING TO OUR ROOMS AND TERRACE.

At paragraph 4 of the Statement it is claimed that *'Visual subservience is incorporated...etc'*. WE DO NOT ACCEPT THIS AT ALL BUT, if it is then it should be explained for the benefit of the Decision Makers and observers and those, such as me, who are involved in these proposals.

Claims that building legibility remains clear are not substantiated by fact and to say that *...the building's visual symmetry is therefore largely maintained.* Are simply untrue for, when the house was first built in 1978-1980 it was of a simplistic quasi Mediterranean design.

Later, the DETACHED double garage beyond the eastern end of the house put it out of kilter and, finally, when this passageway was built into the house and the garage because a luxurious en-suite bedroom, all symmetry was destroyed and it became just another, rather ugly and bitty, semi-detached lacking in any form of rational design and which it remains today. IT IS A MESS and certainly not the claimed 'DETACHED HOUSE'.

Reality appears to click in at paragraph 11 where it is accepted that the building at 56 *'...is not considered an important 'historic' component (OF SOMETHING WHICH IS NOT EXPLAINED) 'but its relationship and impact upon the adjacent Listed Building is relevant.'* REGRETABLELY, DETAILS OF THAT 'RELATIONSHIP' ARE NOT ADDRESSED – BUT IT IS CERTAIN THAT THE BUILDING PROPOSALS WILL IMPACT UPON THE LISTED BUILDING AT 52 THE DRIVE – AND WE SAY AN ENORMOUS AND ADVERSE IMPACT JUSTIFYING REFUSAL OF THE APPLICATION FOR IT WAS LSITED AS RECENTLY AS 27 JULY, 2005. Yet the applicant gives no indication of what impact will result!

It may be the case that precedent exists for a first floor extension and this is certainly in conflict with the Local Plan and the views of English Heritage when they inspected the whole area together with the writer (as Chairman of the Craigweil House and its Environs Conservation Area Association) but those granted are seen as being minor and at the rear and NOT to the front where the LP and CA Statement encourages space and openness And discourages any sideward extension at first floor level. MANY, OF COURSE, will be of pre-Conservation Area designation on the 15 April 2009.

DRAWINGS submitted with this application are, I say, not only abysmal AND SUB-STANDARD FOR SUBMISSION FOR PLANNING CONSENT but inaccurate, misleading – accidentally or deliberately - AND THIS, SURELY, CANNOT BE ACCEPTABLE WITHIN THE Planning Legal System? Yet, from an architect whom one would expect accurately to be able to draw a simple extension to one side of a semi-detached house we have 'Drawing 004 Existing and Proposed Elevations' where the existing front elevation shows no Butler's door to the left (east) of the front GF eastern window and which leads to an internal corridor which then leads to the kitchen to the west, the utility and rear door to the rear (south) and a passageway and door to the double guest en-suite bedroom. This is inaccurate and the Decision Maker is asked to make a decision on inadequate information from the man who lives there and KNOWS!

DRAWING ‘005 Existing & Proposed Elevations’, the ‘Existing’ and ‘Proposed’ elevations are essentially the same and the proposed extension is not shown at all.

Are all involved in viewing these drawings expected to fill in the blanks for the applicant?

The New National Planning Police Framework clearly addresses the issue of development whether or not a development scheme is likely to cause ‘**SUBSTANTIAL HARM**’ or ‘**LESS THAN SUBSTANTIAL HARM**’ which is practical and straightforward to read and understand.

THE APPLICANT TOTALLY IGNORES the NPPF but we say that it is most relevant and significant for, inter alia, it quotes Judge Wakeman who said, inter alia ‘in a NPPF 196 case, the fact of harm to a heritage asset is still to be given more weight than if it were simply a factor to be taken into account along with all other material considerations, and paragraph 196 needs to be read in that way’.

Justice Holgate said, inter alia, ‘The cases make it plain that the balancing exercise required by NPPF 196 is to give the effect to the presumption AGAINST granting permission for development which harms the setting of a Listing Building.’

Craigweil House Conservation House has not been mentioned by the applicant – as with Listed building provisions and NPPF, it is totally ignored – not even mentioned – not its provisions addressed or complied with in any way.

The LP Policy HER SP1 ‘The Historic Environment’ says at paragraph two:-

‘Designated heritage assets including listed buildings, structures and their settings; and Conservation Areas will be given the highest level of protection and should be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance.’ ‘Silvergates’ at 52 The Drive is the ONLY Listed Building within the CHCA, designated 27 July 2005.

Policy HER DM1 ‘Listed Buildings’ says, inter alia, ‘Proposals affecting (and this proposal DOES) statutory Listed Buildings will be required to:

- a. Preserve or enhance the historic character, qualities and special interest of the buildings;*
- b. BE NECESSARY and not detrimental to the architectural and historic integrity and detailing of a Listed Building’s exterior; and completes that list with:-*
- e. Protect, and where possible enhance the setting of the building.*

We say that this application fails to comply with HER DM1 at a, b and c et al.

CONSERVATION AREAS – THE ACT AND LOCAL PLAN

Paragraph 16.4.1 states that:-

‘Conservation Areas are statutorily defined as being ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.’

THIS APPLICATION FAILS THIS TEST ON MANY COUNTS, AS BELOW.

16.4.2 requires that *‘Once designated, special attention must be paid in all planning decisions, to the desirability of PRESERVING OR ENHANCING the character AND appearance.*

16.4.3 declares that ‘special features include *‘...the spaces between buildings’.*

16.4.6 declares, inter alia, *‘The spaces between and around buildings and views are VERY IMPORTANT in Conservation Areas’, and*

16.4.12 **‘SETTING’** states that: ‘Development which adversely affects the setting (and this wall moved to the west will do just that) character and appearance of or views IN TO AND OUT OF A Conservation Area **WILL BE REFUSED**’. THIS EXTENSION is in conflict with this section on all counts AND THE ATTACHED PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN IN TO AND OUT OF THE LISTED BUILDING CLEARLY SHOW THIS.

The effect of approved balcony upon the Listed Building is well seen in multiple photographs showing the position 2M (6’ 6”) out to the right on the 1st floor ‘wing’. Photographs FROM THAT ROOF looks towards the bedroom/dressing room and the ‘private’ terrace (where sun beds are placed in the summer) and BBQ area show that the private terrace will become a public terrace with unobscured views from the balcony. Which is dishonestly claimed to be ‘SCREENED BY GROWTH’. A visit will established that ONLY PLAIN CONCRETE separates the property from the fence boundary of 52.

POLICY HER SP1 – THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT – lays down lays down, without qualification or exception that: **‘DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS** including listed buildings, structures and their settings; and Conservation Areas **will be given THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF PROTECTION** and should be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance’. AW/413/21/HH FAILS TO DO THIS – ON EVERY COUNT.

16.1.5 - declares that:- *‘It is the heritage significance that justifies the degree of protection offered in planning decisions. ‘Silvergates’, 52 The Drive is the largest and privately designed property on the estate and the only Listed Building. It is ‘speciao’.*

EXTENSIONS & ALTERATIONS

13.4.1 declares that ‘The Council is committed to achieving good design in all new development and spaces, **‘INCLUDING EXTENSIONS’ AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BUILDINGS...**’ and we say that the applicant fails to do this at all.

13.4.3 says that extensions to existing buildings should be designed to:- **‘not lead to overlooking, overlowering or overshadowing of neighbouring properties...’**. The proposed westward 1st floor extension will replace block out all sunshine and much light from the east and totally block the expansive views TO THE EAST FACILITATED BY THE 180 DEGREE WINDOWS WHICH GIVE VIEWS AS FAR AS BOGNOR REGIS PIER AND THE SEA AND SHIPPING – A PANORAMIC VIEW WHICH WAS A SIGNIFICANT PART OF OUR DECISION TO BUY THE PROPERTY IN 1978.

13.4.4 says, *inter alia*, that ‘...ANY PROPOSAL will need to demonstrate that through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance, it has been designed **TO RESPECT THE PROPERTY AND ITS SURROUNDINGS.**’

We say that the proposals in this application, taken individually and overall, serve simply to impact adversely on the existing character and appearance of the area and statutory Conservation Area and does absolutely nothing to ‘**preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the setting and environment**’. It carries only a destructive element.

We ask that the photographs be viewed carefully for the applicant has withheld or failed to disclose the CORRECT AND ACCURATE elevations. IT IS A SEMI-DETACHED HOUSE BUILT INTO THE ADJACENT PLOT AT No. 56 – simply because the building owned both plots and was permitted to build as he wished.

Attached is a Sales Plan – which we know is accurate – showing the correct layout, including a door to the left (east) of the house with a corridor leading to the kitchen, utility room and a large double en-suite bedroom. The corridor leads on to the rear door and access to the garden. Raine, Countess Spencer used the main door and the Butler the side door, kitchen etc. Under ‘SETTING’ at 16.4.12, the LP declares that:-

‘Development which adversely affects the setting, character, appearance or or voews in to and out of a Conservation Area will be refused.’

AW/413/21/HH flies in the face of and conflicts with so very much planning Law – statutory and Local - and briefly touched upon above – that we say it should be REFUSED ask the Decision Maker to, please, REFUSE THIS APPLICATION.

Yours faithfully,

Richard D. Ostler (Mr.)

Jill P. Ostler (Mrs.)

INDEX TO PHOTOGRAPHS ATTACHED TO OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

AW-413-21-HH – 54 THE DRIVE

1. Shows a view of the eastern end of the terrace of Grade 2 Listed Building at 52 The Drive (west of application site); the boundary fence; low hedging some years ago; the ride tiled edge of the single story wing and, to the right of the house the site of the balcony already being built. The gutter height of under 6 feet enables anyone over 3' tall to overlook the balcony and have a panoramic view of 52's bedrooms etc.
2. This is the sales plan attached to the Estate Agent's literature when the applicant bought 54. It shows and names the – nearly 30' development left (east) – rooms as are presently laid out, including the Butler's access door, utility room and corridor leading to a back door to the garden and another to a large double bedroom which was originally a double garage. ALL THIS IS ATTACHED TO 56 AND IS A SEMI-DETACHED HOUSE AND NOT, AS DESCRIBED AND SHOWN, A DETACHED HOUSE.
3. View from inside 52's east guest bedroom and Mrs. Ostler's dressing/changing room which now has to have curtains permanently drawn, excluding light and preventing any outward view in this conservation area which is a pleasant panorama looking towards Bognor Regis pier the sea and our own Cherry Blossom tree – in a Conservation Area which we have extensively, through 42 years enhanced.
4. **A similar, clearer, view to 3 but with the window open. THE BOTTOM LINE OF THE TILED LOWER ROOF BY THE FENCE WILL HAVE A SOLID BRICK WALL BUILT UPWARDS TO THE RIGHT HAND CORNER AND THIS WILL REACH UP TO THE EXISTING ROOF. THE VIEW SHOWN WILL THEN BE A BRICK WALL – HAVING AN 'OVERBEARING AND OVERSHADOWING EFFECT ON A NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY' – 52 – IN CONFLICT WITH THE LOCAL PLAN Policy D DM4 (c). The view is excluded!**
5. A further view from the terrace of 52 showing overlooking and overbearing effect.
6. Another view showing the fence, low hedge in 52 and NOT 54 and high wall effect.
7. **Show the front door circa 1980's (painted white) with left extension as described. The double garage is seen, now an en-suite guest bedroom.** Another garage is built.
8. 54 painted terracotta – front views – after Countess Raine Spencer bought as a holiday home which was extensively used to entertain aristocracy and Ministers.

9. 1980'S from application site towards 52, the Grade 2 Listed Building which enjoys, inter alia, a rare Delabole slate roof of extra-ordinary and complex design including the 'diving' roof from the 3rd floor to ground floor – after the style of Sir Edwin Landseer Lutyens,(1869-1944) OM, KCIE, PRA, FRIBA, the famed architect deemed to be the greatest since Sir Christopher Wren and who designed for King George the Fifth the Centotaph in Whitehall, London. NO PERSPECTIVE DRAWING IS PRODUCED BUT THE INFILLING TO ROOF LEVEL TO THE GF GATE WILL ELIMINATE THE LISTED BUILDING COMPLETELY, WHEN IT IS CURRENTLY SEEN FROM THE ROAD ETC AL.
10. This view was taken from the balcony roof of 54 – which is being built now – and shows the direct view into the bedroom, as explained elsewhere in conflict with LP.
11. Lady Spencer was Chairman of the Kensington and Chelsea Council Planning Committee and she treasured Listed Buildings – SHE HAD 22,000 IN HER AREA - and delighted in seeing and studying what she considered to be the beauty of 52's roof.
12. Another view from 52's bedroom window in a different season showing the hedge.
13. Just another tree protected by the owners of the Grade 2 Listed Building.
14. The original 'beach hut' , lavishly refurbished by Lady Spencer for guests to enjoy with drinks etc, standing 1M from the boundary fence of the Grade 2 Listed Building and which has now been painted by the applicant in horizontal, alternative 4" bands with one in white and the next in 'Candy Floss' pink.

Richard D. Ostler