




From: Cllr. Andy Cooper

Sent: 09 November 2018 09:51

To: Colin Chandler

Cc: Planning.Responses;  Karl Roberts; Cllr. Paul Bicknell; Cllr. Dudley Wensley

Subject: Re: 53 Mill Road Avenue

Dear Colin,

Thank you for your email.

I understand your concerns expressed in your email and I look forward to the officer response to this matter.

Cllr Andy Cooper

Arun District Council

Ward member for Angmering, Findon, Patching and Clapham.

From my iPhone

On 7 Nov 2018, at 18:11, Colin Chandler [REDACTED] wrote:

Attention : Zac Denton - Planning Officer

Dear Mr Denton

Re: **53 Mill Road Avenue, BN16 4HX**

Applications: **A/128/18/CLE and A/132/18/HH**

We are writing further to our representations submitted on 26 October.

The Parish Council (PC) on 30/10 resolved to raise no objections to the current 3 applications at the above site. Regrettably, we could not attend that meeting but from neighbour feedback we remain concerned that material considerations were not taken on board. Our primary concern is the proposed use of horizontal cladding (mock timber) on the recently extended dormer.

The PC's decision is contrary to their previous finding on application A/36/16/HH that included the use of the same type cladding in a vertical format on a proposed two storey rear extension when the PC resolved to object on the grounds that: *"...the materials proposed are not in keeping with the the surrounding area and are therefore not in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy HD4: Materials."*

In turn, the application was refused by Arun District Council with the officer report noting that the cladding was: *"...not considered well integrated with the host dwelling...and results in a proposal which is unsympathetic to the character of the original dwelling, contrary to Policy DEV19(i) and GEN7(ii) of the Arun District Plan"*

In relation to the consideration of application **A/128/18/CLE**, account does not appear to have been taken by the PC of the Government guidance dealing with permitted development rights that states: *"the face and sides of a dormer window should be finished using materials that give a similar visual appearance to existing house. So the materials used for facing a dormer should appear to be of similar colour and design to the materials used in the main roof of the house when viewed from ground level. Window frames should also be similar to those in the existing house in terms of their colour and overall shape."*

Two appeal decisions mentioned in our representations are added here again to assist the understanding:

<http://democracy.eastbourne.gov.uk/documents/s6111/Appeal%20Decision.pdf>

<https://democracy.ipswich.gov.uk/documents/s13771/PD-15-15%20Appeal%20122%20Hervey%20Street.pdf>

Both those decisions make it clear that weatherboarding and zinc (as examples) are not *similar* or appropriate materials in the context of traditional tiled roofs, as exists on and about No.53, to attract the benefit of Permitted Development.

We see that since making our previous representations and the PC's consideration, two sets of French doors and two windows have now been installed and finished in grey - a colour that does not accord with other existing windows. That work also now appears to mean the test of lawfulness should fail, aside from the fact the openings bear little resemblance to that shown on the submitted drawing.

To be consistent and noting the particular restrictions on roof level changes, we believe that application **A/132/18/HH** for planning permission, (no doubt submitted in anticipation of A/128/18/CLE being refused) to clad the newly extended dormer at No.53 with similar cladding to that which was previously rejected should also be refused. The impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, as well as the No.53 itself, is demonstrated in the photo taken from our own similar dormer. (No.53, is on the left, showing their dormer before recent additions.) This application remains incomplete without a proposed rear elevation of the dormer.

<IBtUrMeTTqS85XCivwgGw_thumb_1308.jpeg>

As previously stated, there is a perfectly acceptable alternative to 'dress' the dormer with traditional tile hanging, subject to suitable *similar* colour choice.

We have recorded no objection to application **A/130/18/NMA** that seeks to change the cladding for the ground floor extensions previously approved by application A/159/16/HH, as that development does not impact on the surrounding area/roofscape in the same way as changes at first floor level.

June & Colin Chandler
59 Mill Road Avenue.