

Mr Thomas E. Brewis
Roans, Water Lane, Angmering, West Sussex BN16 4EJ

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: A/54/20/HH

With regards to the planning application as referenced above, I am writing to express objections to some aspects of the application as it currently stands. I believe that these can be addressed to the satisfaction of all parties concerned and am prepared to enter into a negotiation with the applicant to agree a solution in order to support a revised application but until that is achieved, I wish my objections to be taken into account when making the decision regarding this current application:

1. The application is not specific about the status of the land owned by the neighbouring property, Roans, and the permitted use of that land by the owners of Ariston. The land is wholly owned by Roans and the owners of Ariston have a right of way over the land to the garage owned by that property; they do not have any rights to park on this land or use it for any other purpose. An agreement is currently in place between myself, as the owner of Roans, and the residents of Ariston that they may park their car in front of their garage; however, this agreement is subject to revision at any time and may not be honoured by any future owner of Roans. It cannot, therefore, be relied upon. The proposed conversion of the garage into ancillary accommodation effectively removes the requirement to provide a right of way for vehicle access.

The plans submitted in respect of the application show a door and window on the east wall opening onto the land owned wholly by Roans; this would seem to suggest that the resident of the ancillary building (I have been advised by the applicant that the intended purpose of the ancillary building is to provide permanent accommodation for a relative) intends to use the land owned by Roans to access the newly created ancillary accommodation.

The plans do show that another door access is to be provided that allows for the resident of the ancillary accommodation to enter and leave via the garden area of Ariston and this is in keeping with the intended purpose of ancillary buildings; this door negates the requirement for a second door onto the land owned by Roans.

Although the current intended purpose of this ancillary building, as described to me by the owners of Ariston, is to accommodate a relative, I have concerns that by constructing the building in such a way as to allow completely independent (from Ariston) access to the building, it has the potential to become a separate dwelling by stealth.

I object to a doorway on the east wall that will provide direct access onto land owned wholly by Roans being included into the construction.

2. Further to the above, the window on the east wall next to the door as described above will significantly reduce the privacy of the owner of Roans as this will look directly onto its private land.

It cannot be assumed that this land will not be incorporated into the garden area of Roans in the future.

I object to the window sited on the east wall of the proposed ancillary building.

3. The plans show that the existing flat roof shared by both garages will be replaced by an elevated section on the new construction; however, the plans do not appear to provide for any guttering that will drain surface water away from the elevated section to be captured within the boundaries of Ariston, instead implying that it will fall onto the flat roof of the garage owned by Roans.

Until revised and more detailed plans are submitted that demonstrate appropriate guttering is included **I object to the change from a shared flat roof to one with an elevated section on the ancillary building.**

4. The plans do not mention creating a firewall between the proposed ancillary building and the adjacent garage owned by Roans, nor do they show electric, water and waste arrangements.

Until more detailed plans are submitted that provide evidence that a firewall will be created and appropriate arrangements made for electricity, water and waste that do not impact upon either the garage belonging to Roans or the site belonging to Roans, **I object on the grounds that insufficient information has been provided to allow for an informed decision.**

5. The submitted plans do not include sufficient detail to provide confidence that the integrity of the garage owned by Roans, and attached in whole to the garage owned by Ariston (that is to form the substantial part of the newly created ancillary accommodation) is protected. I can see no mention in any of the submitted planning application documents that suggest that the applicant gives a commitment to undertake any works required to maintain that integrity and make good any damage or deficit caused through the construction.

6. Regarding the CIL document submitted: I note that in section 4 Liability for CIL the applicant has selected the "No" option; however this application does include the creation of a new dwelling (annexe) through conversion of a building that is not a dwelling; the existing building is a garage.

7. Regarding the Design and Access Statement submitted: I note that in section 9.2 Access to and within site the applicant has stated that the existing parking strategy will remain unchanged, parking to the rear; this arrangement is currently enjoyed through an agreement which is based on the building being a garage - i.e. a building with vehicle access.

I object to the assumption that the continuation of the current parking agreement that is in excess of the Rights of Way be included in this application without clarification that it is subject to change.

8. Regarding the Application Form submitted: I note that in section 9 Site Visit the applicant has stated that the site cannot be seen from a public footpath; the site is visible from an adjacent footpath running to the east of the property.

9. The application does not explain how access for construction workers, their vehicles, storage of construction materials and waste will be managed. The site is small and all the boundaries of Ariston are adjacent to a car park owned by The Lamb Inn.

For the avoidance of doubt the land owned by Roans may not be used at any time before, during and after construction for any purpose save that which is permitted, i.e. access by the owners of Ariston to their garage (and to park their private vehicle under current agreement). **Specifically, when considering this application the planning officers and committee are asked to consider seeking explanation as to how this aspect of the proposed construction is to be managed. The officers and planning committee must be aware that the land owned by Roans may not be used at any time for the purposes of storage of construction materials, waste skips or access by construction personnel and their vehicles, and this must be made a condition of any agreement to the planning application.**

Kind regards,



Mr Thomas E Brewis