

Planning Department
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

18th February 2021

Dear Sirs

Ref: EP/2/21HH

Description of Works: Erection of front extension to create first floor balcony, following demolition of existing conservatory with changes to external materials and wall finishes.

Location: 27A Sea Lane, East Preston, BN16 1NH

I am writing in objection of the rear balcony proposed to No. 27a Sea Lane. I lived in the annexe of No. 27 for several years, as did my brother before me. It is very small and has one bedroom, a tiny bathroom and kitchen and a sitting room, which has double patio doors facing south parallel to No. 27a.

The sitting room in the annexe is approximately 11 metres from the proposed rear balcony (east elevation). And will be directly overlooked by the rear balcony. People on that balcony will be standing very close to the boundary at high level offering them excellent views over the majority of no.27 garden area and will be able to completely overlook the sitting room of the annexe which is the main inhabited space in this small annexe. I know how oppressive and intrusive this would feel as I have lived there. There would be nowhere where you couldn't be seen by people in No. 27a. It is a lovely sunny room, and you would not want pull curtains and net curtains would not be suitable over patio doors. The proposal would change this from a lovely usable space into a very uncomfortable one.

I know from previous planning applications regarding balconies that side screens are often proposed to provide a degree of privacy with the aim to direct views away from neighbouring properties. Sometime these screens are in opaque glass. This solution, whether in opaque glass or solid material, up to 2m high would not address the overlooking concerns and would be a totally unacceptable solution. I know the space and I know it would feel like someone perched on the fence line above you. This is an unacceptable level of overlooking into someone's private garden area, in such close proximity. It also does nothing to direct views away from the bungalows located on Oakley Gardens which have very small gardens and could not even grow planting to screen being overlooked.

There are no precedents of balconies on residential houses in the street. Overall, it does raise the question as to why two balconies are needed on no.27a. The front balcony would overlook Sea Lane, an electrical sub-station and a car park opposite. The rear balcony overlooks many of its surrounding neighbours' inhabitable spaces and private amenity spaces, including established patio areas. The outlook of these two proposed balconies do not match the aspirational design intent of the proposed style, that looks like it suits a seafront location.

I understand owners may wish to enhance their property but it shouldn't be at the expense of its neighbouring properties.

Yours faithfully

K H Sadler
70 Arundel Road, Angmering, West Sussex