

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 11 March 2020 16:18

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: 9 South View, East Preston BN16 1PX – Application reference EP/16/20HH - No Objections Comments

rep

Daun Johnson | Technical Support Unit Assistant, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: GroundFloor, Phoenix House,
Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37762 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737762 | E-mail: daun.johnson@arun.gov.uk



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



Save the environment - think before you print.

Sent: 11 March 2020 15:24

To: Zac Denton <Zac.Denton@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: 9 South View, East Preston BN16 1PX – Application reference EP/16/20HH - No Objections Comments

Dear Mr Denton

No Objection Comments

The property is very visible for residents living on the south side of South View and it is highly visible from our living/dining room, kitchen and rear bedroom. It is also very visible for other immediate residents on the south side of Vermont Drive particularly those within the associated cul-de-sac.

The property is a thatched cottage of significant character. It is well known in the local area and typical of such thatched buildings. There are few of these thatched cottages left although in West Sussex those that remain are revered by the local community as well as visitors to the area. The Reeds, 9 South View was one of the early properties on the Angmering on Sea Estate and whilst not locally listed has some character.

The roof of the premises is a significant bulk of the front and for that matter the rear elevation. Any proposed change should in my view recognise this so that the premises do not become too top heavy in appearance through selection of the proposed new material, its finish and colour.

In May 2019 pre-application advice was sought from the Council on a proposal to replace the existing thatched roof with clay tiles. The planning department's response was that the proposed development would have *"significant impact upon the appearance of the host dwelling, however, this is not necessarily considered to be a harmful one"*. The Council's pre-application advice concluded *"that were an application for planning permission to be submitted it would likely to be approved subject to the further details of the materials."*

In my view the applicant's agent has not yet provided the information requested during the pre-application stage to allow the Council to fully consider the application.

The information requested on the Council's planning application form for the finish and colour of the selected proposed material has not been provided so the Council, I and other members of the public have so far been denied the opportunity to fully visualise the change. On the grounds that the application is incomplete and does not provide the detail requested at pre-application stage I am unable to review the proposal in a positive manner although I expect there are clay tile finishes/colours that would be acceptable and not warrant an objection. Whilst it could be possible to condition the application this denies the general public proper opportunity to comment. As the application is primarily about the change in the roof material, finish and colour it is not unreasonable for the proposal to be properly detailed so that I and the general public can give the matter full consideration. On planning applications in the vicinity of 9 South View the Council have seen that precise details of a proposed material have been provided by the applicant and in fact picked up an applicant when the suggested colour is not actually in the range of the manufacturer's product so it would be good if this information is published prior to determination of the application.

The existing thatched roof finish is visually interesting and any proposed change needs to follow a sensible visual strategy and not materially detract from the properties appearance. The roof of 1 South View opposite our home was replaced a few years back and was sympathetic to the original design.

Thatched roofs are a greater maintenance burden on the building owners and in some instance this can give rise to disrepair whilst a clay tiled roof will require significantly less maintenance. For this reason I think a tiled roof would be a reasonable alternative providing the finish and colour are appropriate.

The proposal includes changing the material of the house roof but not the roof of the associated garage which is also thatched. I am minded this may look incongruous but at least the residents of 7 South View and 54 Vermont Drive will continue to see a thatched building abutting their gardens. Likewise passers-by and other local residents will see remnants of the past site history and character with the thatched garage albeit much diminished in scale.

If the planning department decide there is merit in permitting the roof material to be changed without knowing the full detail I would ask that the planning department see the building still retains an attractive appearance so that the street scene/visual amenity is not materially affected/ harmed and planning appropriate conditions applied. It would in my view unreasonable to permit an obscure finish and colour not consistent with the immediate area.

May I also ask the planning department consider removing any permitted development (PD) rights for any additional windows to be placed in the new clay tiled rear roof so that the gardens/properties of Vermont Drive and those of the adjacent premises in South View do not experience any increase in overlooking. Similarly may I ask that the planning department remove any PD rights for any amendment to the approved materials/finishes/colour to the whole roof. This will avoid uncontrolled changes which could see the building character change dramatically from the village cottage appeal it currently provides. Any future significant changes proposed to the roof could then be subject to a further planning application at the time and be considered on its own merits. This will hopefully protect against seeing a wholesale change in character of the building and minimise the impact on the character of the host dwelling as set out in Policy D DM4.

May I please ask the planning department give all these factors their full and balanced consideration in determining the application to see the visual amenity of local residents is not materially derogated/harmed.

I trust the above observations are of assistance.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Milliner

