

Karen Garner

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 11 November 2014 18:03
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: EP/149/14/PL Rep Letter Mr Jorgenson no 35 Orchard Road, East Preston
Attachments: VIEW FROM ON TOP OF EXISTING GARAGE ROOF INTO NO. 35'S GARDEN.JPG;
NO. 37 AND DWELLING BESIDE PROVING NEW BUILD IS NOT HIGHLY VISIBLE.JPG;
approaching no.37 NO PARKING ISSUES.JPG

Please treat as additional correspondence from applicant.

Anita Gardner | Principal Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maitravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Carolyn Pannell [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 November 2014 18:00
To: Anita Gardner
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EP/149/14/PL Rep Letter Mr Jorgenson no 35 Orchard Road, East Preston

Dear Anita,

This objection letter also covers many of the **INCORRECT** comments of previous letters submitted by other residents.

1. Mistaken **HOUSE** as being **higher once again**, as are many of the other objection letters being re-submitted. There can now be **NO DOUBT** after the letter submitted from the resident of number 33 Orchard Road, by his own admission admitting talking to the residents, that Mr Jorgenson may have also been ill informed with incorrect information too by the same resident, for they are neighbours. Many of these residents are elderly and maybe easily confused, but there definately now seems to be a similar pattern developing in their responses. Yet the plans **CLEARLY** point out the new build to be the **SAME HEIGHT** as number 37 Orchard Road, not **HIGHER**. The Inspectorate before had also confirmed pointed this out.

2. Points out about Character Area 2 and **NEW BUILDINGS SHOULD NOT BE SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER THAN EXISTING PROPERTIES OR HAVE AN OVERBEARING EFFECT ON ADJACENT PROPERTIES**, but the Inspectorate states:-

Point 3. Inspectorate Report- "The site is located in a residential area with a mix of detached and semi-detached Bungalows, as well as 2 bed houses and flats."

Point 10. Inspectorate Report. "I have noted the appeal site is close to the boundaries of Character Areas 2 and 4 which have slightly different criteria for new development."

Point 7." Inspectorate report: I note that the maximum roof height of the proposed dwelling would be the same as No. 37..... These have a low front gable projection and windows to the front which *add to their visual interest*."

The East Preston Village Design Statements does state: "New Builds should be Compatible with,, but **NOT** necessarily the **SAME**, as the existing buildings in the ROAD". Point 10 of Inspectorates report confirms this.

So, Mr Jorgenson's incorrect comments about being contrary to the East Preston Village Design are **INVALID** the new build **IS NOT HIGHER**.

3. How can we look into his garden when the new dwelling we will be further away. In fact we will see less than we can already see from the upper existing rear bedroom of no. 37. Picture attached of current views seen. It can **ONLY** be assumed he has made this comment about his garden and those to the rear **ONLY** because he has been ill informed about the new dwelling being **HIGHER** than the existing no. 37. Making these comments **INVALID**.

4. Hence why he has raised the issue about building in residential gardens and causing harm. The properties of Windlesham Gardens to the rear are new builds in residential gardens, a copy of my plan from the Land Registry has already been submitted. The point raised about causing harm to the local area is because he believes the new build to be higher than no. 37.
Making these comments INVALID.

5. The false statement re any sewer issues can only be assumed as being led by the resident of no. 33 and as I pointed out previously in the 11 years of living at no. 37 neither of these two gentlemen have ever raised this issue before now. Or has Southern Water. As Mr Jorgenson has taken the time to draw on the plans we fail to see how he has missed about the new build being the same height as this is stated in the street elevation almost directly above this on the plans!

Making these comments INVALID.

We are pleased though to see the very last statement in this section he says, "AND WE WOULD GIVE OUR PERMISSION FOR ONE"

6. Re Design.

(i) The Barn style roof shape has already been discussed with Arun Planning and keeping a hip shape roof makes the dwelling look like those in Windlesham Gardens and not Orchard Road. It has also been used to reduce roof size Area and have less impact on its surrounding neighbours. Plus the East Preston Village Design Statements does state: "New Builds should be Compatible with,, but NOT necessarily the SAME, as the existing buildings in the ROAD". Point 10 of Inspectorates report confirms this.

Making these comments INVALID.

(ii) Mr Jorgenson's comments are mistaken once again by the assumption of the dwelling being higher than no 37 and photographs provided show the curve to the road from Lashmar Road he has mentioned is away from the new build. see picture already sent and the attached. So will NOT be at ODDS. **Making these comments INVALID.**

(iii) The shared crossing can be sorted later if either property is sold. As for the hospital within walking distance, the Architect has already made a correction to this on realising the incorrect word, which should have been School. This has already been corrected, a copy has been updated on 28th October 2014 is on-line.

Making these comments irrelevant and INVALID.

(iv) This point is irrelevant and INVALID, as this resident has CLEARLY been incorrectly informed about the height of the new build, probably by his neighbour no.33

(v) How will no. 35 be overlooked and no longer have blue skies?? He ONLY believes this because of the same reason in reply to (iv).

Making these comments irrelevant and INVALID

There can be no doubt that Mr Jorgenson's comments raised for an objection are ALL BASED on an incorrect and MISLEAD assumption that the new build will be towering above the roof line of numbers 37 and 35. Yet the PLANS CLEARLY show the dwelling to be the same height!!

Thus making ALL if his objections INVALID and highlighting the scare mongering of ONE PARTICULAR RESIDENT has caused about this new build. WHICH IS TOTALLY UNFOUNDED. The sudden spat this week of Objections also highlights this with the same OLD objections used over and over again, even after ALL issues have been resolved!

The more of these similar comments that appear the CLEARER it becomes that probably one person is Orchestrating some of the "elderly" residents of Orchard Road and Windlesham Gardens to comment against the new build using incorrect statements.

Yet the Inspectorate had confirmed to the contrary against ALL of these.

Regards, CAROLYN PANNELL

Karen Garner

From: Anita Gardiner
Sent: 12 November 2014 13:23
To: Planning Responses
Subject: FW: EP/149/14/PL Rep Letter from Mr Laker to the rear of no. 37 Orchard Road, 4 Windlesham Gardens
Attachments: VIEW TO BUNGALOWS TO REAR OF NEW BUILD.JPG; DETACHED BUNGALOW ON SOUTH SIDE SET FURTHER BACK INTO GARDEN.JPG; view East showing alignments moving back matching new build.JPG

Please treat as additional correspondence from applicant

Anita Gardiner | Principal Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Carolyn Pannell [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 November 2014 20:27
To: Anita Gardiner
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EP/149/14/PL Rep Letter from Mr Laker to the rear of no. 37 Orchard Road, 4 Windlesham Gardens

Dear Mrs Gardner,

The Objection letter submitted by Mr Laker once again **HIGHLIGHTS** the confusion that has now been relayed to these elderly residents.

Mr Laker refers to "A new property which **HAS BEEN TURNED SIDEWAYS** to fit on to a site which is too small for further development MAY look like one half of a semi-detached Bungalow from the front.

- A. Point 12. Inspectorate Report I am **satisfied that there would be enough private garden space for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling.**
- B. The dwelling is **NOT** sideways. The front elevation **CLEARLY** shows the same low front gable appearance, sloping roof with matching Velux window, as no. 37
- C. The dwellings front and rear footprint elevations are North and South- refer to plans.

Thus making Mr Laker's comments **INVALID**. He clearly does not understand the new plans presented.

The site **CANNOT** be described as a Shoehorn, refer to Architects statement re garden dimensions and minimum floor areas of proposed dwelling. Including space left around the new dwelling, plus Inspectorates report clarifies size of plot.

Making this comment INVALID.

D. The distance to Mr Laker's boundary more than meets planning regulations re distances to Boundary. **Making this comment INVALID**

E. Barn ends have been used to **minimise the roof area** to assist blending of the property with existing street scenes and great care has been taken to not affect any adjoining properties by using this.

F.. Photograph's already submitting show the views already seen from the upper rear bedroom of no. 37. These will be no different.

Mr Laker's comment about "There are only semi-detached or terraced bungalows" is untrue.

- G. (i) No 1 Orchard Road is a **DETACHED** bungalow. Photograph already provided.
- (ii) There are **NO** terraced Bungalows in Orchard Road.

(iii) It was the Inspectorate that stated:-Point 3. Inspectorate Report- *"The site is located in a residential area with a mix of detached and semi-detached Bungalows, as well as 2 bed houses and flats."*

Point 10. Inspectorate Report. "I have noted the appeal site is close to the boundaries of Character Areas 2 and 4 which have slightly different criteria for new development."

Mr Laker states that "there is a mix of one and two storey properties in Orchard Road but that is NOT TRUE of the South side where no 37 is located" is completely UNTRUE as:-

H. We must point out that No. 37 IS ALREADY A TWO STOREY DWELLING, with two bedrooms and a bathroom on the second floor. There are others that can be seen close by in the picture showing across the roofs of the SOUTH SIDE of Orchard Road gardens- see below attached photograph.
Making this comment INVALID.

Mr Laker once again shows more confusion about the height of the new build referring to "there are no houses visible from Windlesham Gardens".

I. The new build is the SAME HEIGHT as no 37 and other Bungalows of Orchard Road on the South side!
Making this comment INVALID.

Mr Laker's comment about being cramped is obviously due to the fact that he believes the new build to be a HOUSE and tower above its neighbours, which it does not. Plus the Inspectorate has already confirmed the height would be the same.

J. Point 12. Inspectorate Report "I am satisfied that there would be enough private garden space for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling."
Making this comment INVALID.

Mr Laker's comment re residential amenity NO LONGER applies.

K. The entrance to no. 37 has been addressed and the Kitchen window of No. 37 will no longer exist under the new proposal.
Making this comment INVALID

Mr Laker has shown that he is confused about actual street scenes, appearance and size of dwelling. But he has proven not the ONLY resident doing this.

Mr Laker has also contradicted the Inspectorates findings .

One being:-

Point 9. Inspectorate Report. On my visit I noted that there are other examples of dormers within the wider area including rear dormers to the properties at Windlesham Gardens

For these reasons above Mr Laker's comments should be deemed as INVALID.

Regards, CAROLYN PANNELL

Karen Garner

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 12 November 2014 13:23
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: EP/149/14/PL Rep Letter from Mrs B KENT, 32 Orchard Road. EP
Attachments: DAY STREET SCENE EAST.JPG; orchard road outside numbers 32 35 and 33 3rd July 11.00pm.JPG

Please treat as additional correspondence from applicant

Anita Gardner | Principal Planner, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltrovers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Carolyn Pannell [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 November 2014 18:35
To: Anita Gardner
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: EP/149/14/PL Rep Letter from Mrs B KENT, 32 Orchard Road. EP

Dear Mrs Gardner,

The fact that Mrs Kent states "my views haven't changed since last application."
Makes her NEW objection letter irrelevant and INVALID as Mrs Kent had previously stated:-
"I strongly object to the look of the sideways building". "Parking problems"

1. The new build definitely **DOES NOT** have a SIDEWAYS appearance and the new application is completely different. It now mimics the other surrounding dwellings around it. **INVALID COMMENT**
2. Parking has already been addressed and photographs sent show vehicles parked on the verge DO NOT belong to us. As we are only losing two parking spaces and two extra ones or more will be created on the front garden of no. 37. All cars belonging to number 37 are fully Road Taxed, so if we wished could Park on the road. The photographs attached shows the street scene views outside Mrs Kent's address. The same can be seen on Google Earth.

These comments are INVALID.

Regards, CAROLYN PANNELL

