

[REDACTED]

From: Colin Chandler [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 October 2018 15:55
To: Planning.Responses; [REDACTED]
Cc: Karl Roberts
Subject: 53 Mill Road Avenue, Angmering BN16 4HX

Attention : Zac Denton - Planning Officer

Dear Mr Denton

RE: 53 Mill Road Avenue, Angmering, BN16 4HX
Application numbers: A/128/18CLE & A132/18HH

We now see the above applications under consideration, submitted post work having commenced in the summer to alter the existing dormer for which we had no prior knowledge.

Monitoring the work, we noted the existing central dormer was being extended either side - in principle additions that did not concern us and noting the existing tiles were stored on the scaffolding that we presumed would be reused.

However, towards the end of August we saw vertical battening was being installed and that the stored tiles had been removed, indicating that tile hanging was not going to be (re)used. It then became apparent that the applicant was intent on using similar cladding on the extended dormer similar to that proposed on a failed attempt in 2016 (Ref: A/36/16/HH) to add a 2-storey rear extension, which the officer's report noted that the use of 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"

Indeed, the Parish Council (in addition to our own concerns) recorded 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."*

We see that whereas the refused scheme had proposed vertical cladding, it is now proposed in a horizontal format for the approved ground floor extensions (Ref: A/159/16/HH) which had previously included vertical cladding to which we did not object due to its limited impact on the appearance of the surrounding area. We have no objection to that proposed change at ground floor level (Application A/130/18/NMA).

Critically, and what may not be apparent to non-residents, is that the depth of the rear dormer on No.53 is greater than the others in the immediate surrounding garden scene. A situation arising due to the existing dormer rising off the rear wall of No.53, as opposed to being set back in from the rear walls as exists on neighbouring dwellings. Whilst that size format is within the permitted development limits what it does mean is that the increased height of vertical faces accentuates the mass of material that would occupy the dormer, in comparison to others locally. Currently the extended dormer is clad in protective sheeting that serves to show the overall size of the dormer.

To assist the understanding of the above, please see photos in the attached pdfs:

Application A/128/18CLE seeking to verify that a wholesale change in the external material from individual plain tiles to 3.6 metre horizontal lengths of fibre cement weather boarding finished in Light Oak is a 'similar material' as required by Class B.2(a) of the GPDO and to avoid the need for planning permission, is incomprehensible. Having obtained a sample of the weather boarding it is quite clear that adding that material at roof level would be wholly discordant with the remaining plain tiles on the roof slope aside from its visual impact by its mass in the garden scene. The supporting statement by the owner: "Cladding to Dormer", contains factual inaccuracies - i.e. the existing dormer has not been demolished; the "existing planning consent (A/159/16/HH) did not include changes to the dormer and indeed that 2 year old planning permission has not been implemented. So the suggestion that the cladding would blend with existing materials is to date only a proposition and ignores the clash with the current remaining roof tiles. Reference is made to tile colour differences on a neighbouring property, but the fundamental difference there is that the roof slope and dormer are consistent in their use of plain tiles. It is that scenario that where the use of 'similar materials' specified in Class 2.B(a) is understandable given the dormers added to local dwellings are all post original build and inevitably results in colour and weathering differences, aside from availability issues after many decades. To help the interpretation please see the outcomes in the following appeal decisions as examples that highlight that using a wholly different material does not accord with the use of "similar materials" requirement:

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

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

Were application A/128/18CLE to be found to meet the GPDO requirements as set out in Class B.2(a) and be granted that would immediately make the need for planning application A/132/18/HH redundant, and frustrate the democratic consideration of the proposed materials. But as noted above, it would also contradict the finding on refused application A/36/16/HH as regards the impact on both the character of the existing dwelling and not be in keeping with the surrounding area, and noting the attached appeal examples both allude to the impact on rear areas not viewed from the public domain.

As we stressed in our representations on the refused application and we do so again, if the dormer were clad in suitable plain tiles, and given the 'blending' issue raised by the applicant that could include the remaining rear roof slope tiles, we would have no objections.

Whereas the "REAR ELEVATION East" on drawing 15060/LDC submitted with application A/128/18CLE shows the dormer as extended with window/door openings, that is not replicated on drawing 15060/02R3 submitted with application A/132/18/HH that simply shows the dormer as previously existing and the approved single storey addition. We are not clear whether the openings we saw formed in the extended dormer before the protective sheeting was added reflect that shown on drawing 15060/LDC and are indeed the final choice, but in any event their design and with the added French doors (presumably as a Juliet style balcony) also seriously begs the question as to whether the advice contained in the second bullet point of the Government's Technical Guidance supporting Class B.2(a) of the GPDO as to whether the interpretation has been fully respected:

- *"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." (Our underlining)*

Given the French doors could easily afford access to the roof of the approved single storey extension (if built) and thereby harm neighbouring privacy, we trust that in the event a planning permission were to be granted for the dormer a suitable condition would be imposed to restrict such potential.

We do hope that our concerns will be upheld and the applicant will see their way to 'dress' the roof changes in a more sympathetic manner that would respect the local appearance.

Thank you.

June & Colin Chandler
59 Mill Road Avenue.









