

Formal Objection to Application Reference: BR/255/18/HH- 30 Mansfield Road.

Date: 04.11.18

Dear Ms Willard,

Following the latest submission for planning permission at 30 Mansfield Road we write to you with the following comments as we would wish to formally object to the latest application/proposal.

Firstly, we would like to formally request that a site visit is performed to No 28 Mansfield Road, our home, in order to establish the full impact of the completed and proposed development at No 30. Please can you contact us on the details at the end of this letter to arrange a suitable time. We also highlight to the case officer that the submitted block/location plan does not accurately show the footprint at No 28 and therefore the true relationship between the properties. A site visit to No 28 however, would provide the case officer with this information.

Under BR/305/17/HH the applicant submitted an application for 'New roof with first floor accommodation & new dormer & new single storey rear extension'. This included a hipped roof formation and was permitted earlier this year. We objected to the proposed works in relation to the out of keeping design of the development, and the adverse impact it had to our property and amenity. This was in particular to the dormer development and installation of windows which looked directly across into our home and habitable rooms we once considered private. The officer was in agreement with us and conditioned the decision for the windows within the first floor side dormer to be fitted with obscure glass and fixed shut unless higher than 1.7m from the proposed finished floor level.

Following the previous permission which was granted application BR/69/18/HH was submitted proposing a gable roof form to both the front and rear of No 30. We asked that the same condition was carried over regarding the dormer windows under BR/305/17/HH and as the officer agreed that over-looking and harm to our amenities would be impacted, the condition was carried over.

However this does not seem to have been carried out under both past applications and this development has now been completed. Although fitted with obscure glass there is strong concern that the windows are openable under 1.7m from the proposed finished floor levels which shall cause us to be over-looked and our privacy lost. Application BR/255/18/HH does not annotate or show anywhere with supporting statements that obscure glass and fixing shut these windows are proposed. Therefore we would ask the case officer to seek clarity on this, have the plans updated and condition this either to be done, retained, or carried out retrospectively under a modest timeframe. We would appreciate an update on this prior to any formal determination of the application and do not consider that windows fitted with obscure glass but openable protect our privacy levels sufficiently. The windows must be fixed shut also.

Under the original application BR/305/17/HH it was justified that the works complied with policies GEN7 and DEV19 however we would disagree with this when taking into account the full extent and size of the works proposed at No 30. Over the course of time the works have altered the roof form, have raised the ridge height and now propose a 3m deep extension at first floor. This combined bulk on No 30 creates a stark side elevation that is neither in keeping to the locality of Mansfield Road nor subservient on No 30- aspects that both policies seek to achieve. Combined with the close proximity of the development to the shared boundary with No 28 the works shall appear oppressive and over-bearing from our home and create an un-neighbourly impact as a result. It would also be noted that this goes against the National Planning Policy Framework, GEN7 and DEV19 guidance

which requests that two storey extensions are set away from shared boundaries by more than 1 metre. Something that is not achieved in this proposal.

We would like it noted that had the applicant carried out the original development as approved under BR/305/17/HH then alongside the obscure glass and fixing shut of the dormer windows we would have considered the development to be in a reasonable form. However, with the height of the hip as proposed a strong impression was given that this roof was to be used as a sun terrace. This fear of the area being used in this way has lead the applicant to now apply for the full roof works, removing the site as a terrace but increasing significant mass and bulk instead.

It is our belief that the roof finish to the ground floor rear extension was never for cosmetic purposes but to use the area as a sun terrace via the Juliet doors.

In an ideal scenario we would have preferred a lower hip roof surrounding the ground floor extension to be reduced in height and a condition attached to this approval preventing the area to be used as a terrace and/or balcony. Or the design could have been altered under request of the Local Planning Authority to show a window instead of double doors and Juliet balcony. If this application, as hoped, shall be refused we would like the use of the roof to the ground floor extension restricted so it is not to be used as a terrace/balcony.

We feel that this overall scale on No 30 warrants a refusal of planning permission based on it being contrary to policy and un-neighbourly. The works at No 30 alter the existing dwellinghouse substantially. This current application increases the scale of a modest bungalow significantly into an overly deep house which has a stark and oppressive side elevation and appearance from Mansfield Road and our property. We acknowledge that the previous submissions were allowed but ask that this current application to increase the size of the home further is refused.

Unfortunately, the approach from the applicant and submitting three applications at different times throughout 2018 which have altered the proposal and increased its size has come across as unprofessional and un-neighbourly.

It has caused a dis-trust between neighbours and caused significant stress and anxiety throughout. It is considered that a much smaller scale development could achieve a generous bedroom size at first floor without the need for the overly large bedroom with substantial cupboard space which at a cost results in the poor and bulky design of No 30 and causes a significant adverse impact to neighbouring dwellings. Therefore we ask that any case officer takes a detailed and sensitive approach to assessing the plans to ensure that the applicant is applying for all the works required to ensure a deviation or alteration from proposed plans does not occur in future.

Please can you acknowledge a receipt of this letter.

Kind regards,

Mr and Mrs R E Chisnall

28 Mansfield Road

Bognor Regis

West Sussex

PO22 9EY

