Mr. & Mrs. M. Taylor,
4, Seafield Terrace,
Stocker Road, Bognor Regis,
West Sussex. PO21 2QQ
[redacted]

Planning Dept. Arun District Council
Littlehampton BN 17 5LF

20.7.11

JC

REF. BR/160/11
CONTACT MRS T CHAPMAN

SUBJECT :- JULIETTE BALCONY No 5 SEAFIELD TERRACE BOGNOR REGIS

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
21 JUL 2011

Dear Sir,

This plan is ACK already the same as the one refused by the Council in May 2010, with the addition of the word Juliet, and its width and depth similarly to No 4.

The owners of these houses have had high walls and fences built to create private patio gardens and numbers 4 & 6 have real juliette balconies and these combined with the brick piers between the houses give us privacy in our first floor bedrooms and the corners of our gardens (see attached photo)

If any balcony larger than a Juliette is built we will loose this privacy and in the case of Nos 4 & 6 will block their sea views.

The balanced flue under the proposed balcony has appeared in recent years and the prevailing west wind blows fumes into our windows and could be a hazard to users of the new balcony and the balcony floor might direct more fumes to us in No 4.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL BR/160/11/

[redacted]

Tel: 01243 763420

6 Seafield Terrace,
Stocker Road,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
PO21 2QQ
29th June, 2011.

The Planning Officer,
Arun District Council,
The Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton,
West Sussex.

TECHNICAL SUPPORT
29 JUN 2011
ACTION
INITIALS

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application BR160/11

It has been brought to our attention that a further planning application has been submitted for a balcony to be added to the rear of the property at 5 Seafield Terrace, Stocker Road, Bognor Regis, PO21 2QQ. Unfortunately we were not aware that an application had already been submitted until yesterday afternoon.

There have been concerns over the design and size of a balcony planned for this property in the past which we understand was disallowed by the planning committee (BR/53/10). The new application which does not appear to be supported by drawings, states firstly that the structure is a 'Juliet Balcony'. However, we have been approached just recently, by the owners asking us to accept a structure projecting out one metre which we would not be in favour of as this would stand out from the tiny balconies on either side. We are now aware that we were approached only after the planning application had already been submitted.

As we understand it, the definition of a 'Juliet Balcony' balcony (similar to our own) is simply a safety rail which does not allow a person to stand outside. Can we be assured that if planning consent is given, this is all that would be constructed? We are concerned for our privacy because if any projected balcony is constructed, as the patio doors behind the proposed balcony are very close to our own, a projecting balcony would seriously compromise our

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL BR/160/11/

privacy and give a direct view into our living room. It would also compromise the privacy of persons residing in Marlborough House.

We are also concerned that any balcony structure added should be in keeping with the general design of the properties on either side (please see photograph) in an attempt to try to preserve the integrity of the remainder of the south elevation. Most of the existing balconies and certainly those surrounding no 5, are of an open 'bar' design and to impose a glass structure in the middle of this would present a very untidy look and would be out of character for the terrace .

I trust your planning committee will be able to consider our comments before making a decision.

Yours faithfully,

Mr and Mrs A Bradley

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL BR/160/11/

3 SEAFIELD TERRACE
STOCKER ROAD
BOGNOR REGIS
WEST SUSSEX
PO21 2QQ
Tel: 01243 861142

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TECHNICAL SUPPORT
19 JUL 2011
ACTION
SYS

The Planning Officer
Arun District Council
The Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

18 July 2011

Dear Sir

Planning Application BR/160/11 - 5 Seafield Terrace
Mrs H Thomas/Case Officer Mrs J Chapman

I have studied the above Planning Application for a first floor balcony to the south elevation of Number 5 Seafield and I should like to explain my opposition to this addition to the property.

In point 3 of this Application, I was concerned to see that the proposed works are described as a Juliette Balcony, which could be misleading, as it is not an accurate description of a balcony of the proposed dimensions.

With reference to point 6, the reference to Application BR/337/07 and No 2 Seafield Terrace permitted development seems irrelevant. I understand that this Application was withdrawn and the building works carried out at No 2 Seafield Terrace in 2007 did not need planning permission. I understand that since October 2008 planning permission is now required for balconies.

The proposed balcony is to be constructed of galvanized steel frame, aluminium sections and toughened glass, which is out of character with the adjoining properties. The balconies at numbers 2, 3 4 and 6 Seafield have railings and although they are not identical they are of a similar style.

The proposed balcony is deeper than those at the adjoining properties, which are less intrusive and I am concerned that it will have a detrimental affect on the privacy of the neighbours, in particular the occupants of No 6.

I am not against a balcony, in principle, if it is of a sympathetic design to those with railings at numbers 2, 3, 4 and 6 Seafield Terrace and it should respect the privacy of the neighbours.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Mrs Catherine Hunter

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL BR/160/11/

Mrs K Rawlings
Flat 1,
3 Stocker Road
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO21 2QH

Your Ref: Inet 000011004
Our Ref: BR/160/11/
Please ask for:
Mrs J Chapman

11th July 2011

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

First floor juliette balcony to south elevation
5 Seafield Terrace Stocker Road Bognor Regis

Thank you for your internet representation made on 10th July 2011 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *We objected tp previous applications for this balcony.*
>
> *The reason we have an objection is that we feel this once again has a great impact on our privacy as we will be over looked in every room of our ground floor flat.*
>
> *We strongly feel this balcony is too close to our flat.*
>
> *We know that this property is not a main family home and is letted out to various people as a week/weekend let.*
>
> *As we do not know who will be at this property from one day to the next we fear not only as said our privacy but to whom can over look onto our children.*
>
> *Many thanks*
>
> *K Rawlings*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal o

ine.

permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete