

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 16 November 2020 09:00
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: EP/124/20/HH

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, Arun District Council | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at Error! Hyperlink reference not valid. • • • Save the environment - think before you print.

-----Original Message-----

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 November 2020 11:24
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: EP/124/20/HH

Daun Johnson
Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning

T: 01903 737762
E: daun.johnson@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](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Harlow [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 November 2020 11:21
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>; Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: nicola.harlow [REDACTED]
Subject: EP/124/20/HH

Good Afternoon,

This is the last day that I have access to the information superhighway for a couple weeks and maybe longer, so I need to complete my objections to EP/124/20/HH.

For peace of mind, I am providing copies of two e-mails that I sent to andrew.wood@arun.gov.uk that are yet to appear in the planning portal. I wouldn't want them lost.

email number 1:

Good Morning,

There will be a lot to get through with our observations and objections to planning application EP/124/20/HH (23 Upper Drive, East Preston) so there is no time like the present to make a start.

This objection communication is solely to highlight mistakes and false information in the submitted planning application. My detailed objections to the plan itself will follow in due course.

Point 1. Planning Application Form. Item 6. Question 2. Will any trees or hedges need to be removed...?

The trees and vegetation that grew on the site of the proposed structure were removed in June and July 2020. Subsequently, the boundary fence disintegrated. The boundary fence between numbers 23 and 25 is my responsibility.

The new open aspect is pleasant and means that I do not need to reinstate a substantial fence as a vegetation control measure. The 'now absent' fence is shown in document 203075/04C.

This needs to be ignored in the planning process as it shows a screen that does not exist forward of the building line.

Point 2. Planning Application Form. Item 7. Pedestrian and vehicle access.

Question "Is a new or altered vehicle access proposed to or from the public highway?" Answer provided: 'No'

There is a proposal in the planning application to make changes to the verge in front of number 23. For information, the verge is owned by the Angmering-on-sea Estate Association. The proposal is to reduce the size of vehicle access from almost the whole frontage to a size that is not provided. From observation, you may guess at a figure.

Two points:

- a) The answer provided on the application form is wrong.
- b) The intention to 'remove tarmac and reinstate grass verge' (203075/05B) is to be decided elsewhere and should not be included for consideration here.

Point 3. Planning Application Form. Item 8. Parking. Will the proposed works affect existing parking arrangements? The answer given is debatable.

- a) The response makes no mention of the existing integral garage. The absence of the word 'additional' is required.
- b) The proposed works will simply provide potential covered garage space where two existing uncovered parking spaces were.
- c) More than 50% of structures that were built as garages are no longer used to keep cars in. 100% of the current garages at number 23 Upper Drive have not seen a car inside them whilst I have lived in East Preston.

I would suggest an accurate response to the question would be "The creation of roof linked detached structure will cover the ground where two cars previously stood"

Point 4. Existing floor plans 203075/01

The ground floor plan contains a 'mistake' that gives the application the impression that there is currently no garage. The integral garage is labelled as a 'Dining Room'. This 'mistake' was also in planning application EP/96/20/HH and numerous objectors pointed this out. Someone even took a photograph and submitted it with their objection letter. The fact that the 'mistake' is retained in the latest application is a cause for concern.

As I said earlier, these are just errors and misinformation in the submitted planning application. I am submitting them now for your consideration to determine if this planning application is safe. I do not know were the threshold is that would trigger an unsafe label, but this should be considered.

In the mean time, I will be preparing my objections to the application itself.

I know that it is early in the process, but should this planning application be called-in to committee, I believe that I have the right to address that meeting. I am letting you know that I wish to exercise this right.

Regards,

Stephen Harlow

25 Upper Drive

East Preston

=====

email number 2:

Hello again,

In addition to my e-mail from earlier today, I can now report problems in documents 203075/02 and 203075/04.

Since 203075/02 was prepared in July 20, the owners have had a new window created on the south side of the house on the ground floor. This window is not in the South Elevation drawing. The bottom central (most southerly) part of the chimney has been removed (visible in the East and West Elevations).

This window is, however, shown in 203075/04 and is identified as an existing window. This drawing is also dated July 20.

Document 203075/04 shows the modifications made to the chimney on the south side of the house. The current width of the chimney is shown in the East and West Elevation drawings.

An additional issue is that the North Elevation of document 203075/04 shows a 1.8 m high boundary fence in red dotted lines. Red is the colour on these drawings of new proposals. I have sole responsibility for that boundary fence, and I can assure you that there will not be a large fence erected there on the boundary. I would expect the plan to be amended before consideration of the application takes place because the inclusion is most misleading.

I can only suggest that these issues add weight to any suggestion that this planning application is unsafe.

On an administrative note, I have just noticed the new window proposal on the south side of the property. There is no yellow planning notice being displayed on Manor Road. I would have expected that the affected adjacent properties would have a planning notice in their street.

All for now,

Stephen Harlow

25 Upper Drive

East Preston

=====

Than concludes the recap. These are now my objections to the content on the planning application.

1. I object to the proposed first floor windows. The applicants remove the mature shrubbery screen on the southern boundary of their property and now propose to introduce a window that provides a fine view of the two reception rooms of number 59 Manor Road. Privacy is and should be protected.

2. I object to the large (5.5m x 5.5m x 3.67m) structure in the front garden. These are the reasons:

2.1 The structure is described as a garage. Are there any means to ensure that it is only ever used to keep cars in? The existing integral garage at the property has not seen a car inside it whilst I have been in East Preston. The building of a 'garage' would actually reduce the amount of safe parking space. Currently all vehicles enter the site perpendicular to the road. If a double garage existed, the entrance to the garage could not be used for car-standing without the need for shuffling. Upper Drive is narrow, so shuffling of vehicles could be dangerous and would certainly be annoying to residents.

2.2 Arun DC Design Guide says "Extensions should also preserve the amenity of the original and neighbouring properties in terms of privacy and overshadowing". The structure would degrade the light and amenity at Number 23 Little Dormers itself. The natural light to the reception room would be reduced and also affect the amenity for current and future residents.

2.3 As the owner of the adjacent property (number 25) I can report that the structure would be guilty of overshadowing and loss of amenity.

Light would be lost in my closest reception room. The structure would be 2.5m from the east facing window and extends 5m forward of my house.

Failing the usual 45 degree test, this structure should not be built.

2.4 The proposed structure is beyond the building line in this part of Upper Drive. It would be an over-bearing presence of the street scene - contrary to Arun Local Plan (2011-2031) Pages 159 -160: Policy D DM4. My opinion is that it would make an adverse contribution to the street scene and so would not meet the principle of the East Preston 2014-2019 Neighbourhood Submission plan (esp 4.10 and 4.16)

2.5 There is the possibility that a wind tunnel effect could be created by the building of the structure.

Stephen Harlow

25 Upper Drive

East Preston