

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 November 2020 12:32
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: EP/124/20/HH Little Dormers 23 Upper Drive BN16 1QN - Objection

rep

Zachariah Denton
Planning Officer

T: 01903 737500 (37337)
E: zac.denton@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Stephen Milliner [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 November 2020 11:39
To: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>; Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: EP/124/20/HH Little Dormers 23 Upper Drive BN16 1QN - Objection

Dear Mr Denton

I see that following the withdrawal of application EP/96/HH/20 the applicant has submitted a new application with some minor tweaks to the plans/elevations and a change to the rear elevation removing the Juliet balconies.

The applicant has still defined the space at the very north east of the existing dwelling on the plan submitted as a dining room. This is not the case and the space is a garage. I enclose photographic evidence to confirm this and I believe the existing elevation on the application shows the garage door.

What is proposed at the front of the property will result in a horrendous street view with a blank flank wall immediately adjacent to the highway road/verge together with the remaining significant roof massing above. Upper Drive is an eclectic mixture of residential buildings, generally low in height plus set back from the highway and the proposal significantly derogates the existing visual amenity.

The proposals do not meet the requirements of the East Preston neighbourhood Plan Policy 2: Design in Character Area One, which Upper Drive falls within. This policy requires the development to preserve the street scene and avoid an increase in density that would alter the character of the area.

The East Preston Neighbourhood Plan policy 2 also states the existing street scene should be protected and the construction of high front walls or fences should be resisted. It then sets out that the character of the area is largely created by the green appearance of the roads which should be preserved.

The proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy D DM4 which states that extensions and alterations which are visible on the street-scene should respect the established spatial character and pattern of the street, and make a positive contribution to the locality. Policy D DM4 also requires any extension to demonstrate that through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance to be designed to respect the property and its surroundings and be distinctive of the wider setting. The proposal is still very aggressive in scale at the front of the site and does not meet the requirements of planning policy.

The new double garage front extension will be very close to the boundary of 25 Upper Drive and significantly block the view/transparency between buildings that currently exists. Such a transparent view between buildings is an integral part of the character of the Angmering on Sea Estate often described as the green garden estate.

The four-bedroom house currently has hard standing across the complete frontage of the site together with a garage in the NE corner of the dwelling. This proposal desires the existing garage to be kept as a garage, supplemented with a further large double garage in front which means that the access arrangements for vehicles will be impaired and the space in front of the proposed garage will be needed to gain access to the proposed garage. I am minded that these proposals therefore mean the remaining hard standing cannot be meaningfully used as onsite parking spaces and the actual parking space provisions for the development are being reduced. Upper Drive is a very narrow road and double shuffling vehicles in this narrow road could be dangerous and annoying. In addition, as access to the existing garage will need to be through the new proposed extension this also limits the practical use of the proposed extension.

There is a new window proposed at first floor on the south elevation within bedroom 2 which may cause overlooking issues to the dwelling to the south of the development (21 Upper Drive). The applicant has now shown obscure glass but also shows an opening window. The height of the opening window above the internal finish floor level is not defined and as such overlooking prevention is not confirmed on the drawing. This is in conflict with policy D DM4 although should be easily resolved by a condition.

The positioning of the red line on an application for planning is amended from that previously shown on application EP/99/20/HH and now in the correct location. There is works to the east of the development boundary shown on the drawing and whilst making the AOSERA verge green as originally intended on the

estate is welcomed it should not be considered in the application decision as any works are outside the application defined by the red line.

The street scene will be detrimentally changed and there will now be a massive lump in someone's front garden spoiling the immediate front view but also the open view from the north of Upper Drive/South View and also from Manor Road.

The residents of 25 Upper Drive will have their front garden view derogated with a new relatively high garage immediately adjacent to their property and for just about the complete length of their front garden. Whilst the height of the garage is reduced from that shown on application EP/99/20/HH it is still significant in height and the overall plan area of the proposal has not reduced in significance so is still enormous and overbearing in front of the existing dwelling. The development does not reflect the spatial character and pattern of the street as required by policy D DM4 and derogates the visual amenity.

I am minded the extent and height of the proposed development may have a daylight/sunlight impact on the adjacent dwelling despite being lower than previously shown on application EP/99/20/HH. The proposed garage will be overpowering causing overshadowing of the adjacent property. Policy D DM4 requires an extension not to be overpowering and overshadow neighbouring properties and as such the proposal does not meet the requirements of D DM4.

The existing plan indicates there is sufficient space to provide additional garage accommodation on the south side of the existing dwelling set back from the front elevation in a conventional manner not affecting the street scene and probably compliant with planning policy so I believe there is no valid reason for permitting a scheme which is to the detriment of the local amenity and not policy compliant.

I see the proposal has two garage doors on the new extension. This might be for access to the retained garage but there is a fear that these two doors could be open for significant periods of time and the garage used as a repair facility rather than for standard residential night time garaging of a motor vehicle. This could lead to a further derogation of the visual amenity plus noise nuisance. It would be a shame if a workshop appearance is presented on a leafy residential road. Similarly, if the west facing garage door is open the occupants of 25 Upper Drive will be looking in to a garage when the west door is open rather than the leafy street scene they currently enjoy and although the applicant has now indicated there will be a fence on the north boundary such fence cannot be guaranteed to be in place for ever unless conditioned to remain in place in perpetuity.

Does a dwelling of the scale at Little Dormers require such large internal garage spaces (existing and proposed) and should the Council not be discouraging such facilities?

The covered open sided link connection between the existing garage and the new garage combined with the location of the new garage is likely to cause a wind tunnel effect and southerly winds are likely to cause increased wind speeds at the frontage of 25 Upper Drive. This effect can be very disconcerting particularly for elderly people and in some instances completely intolerable although this application now shows a fence on the north side of the development which should suppress such effects at low level.

The boundary fence is shown as being 1.8m height right up to the front/east boundary of the property which affects the visual amenity. It would be better if such a fence was set back from the adjacent land ownership/frontage or reduced in height at the front of the development to say 1m and remain no higher in perpetuity.

I trust the above observations are of assistance and would ask that the planning department refuse the application. If however, the Council is minded to approve the application could I please request the following:

That those parts of the proposal shown as garage space are used for garage/parking space only in perpetuity and any permitted development rights for the new development are extinguished. This is to avoid a change of use to further living accommodation increasing the likelihood of offsite parking.

That the overlooking issue is dealt with in a manner consistent with other planning applications and obscure glass plus non opening windows below a height of 1.8m from FFL are adopted to prevent such overlooking and be provided in perpetuity.

That the materials and style/arrangement of the north boundary fence shown on the application be submitted and approved by the Council and that any fence on the north side of the development should remain in perpetuity and in the style/arrangement approved by the Council to prevent further derogation of the visual amenity and possible wind issues to the adjacent property.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Milliner
2 South View
East Preston
Littlehampton
BN16 1PX

