

Mr G E and Mrs A P Mathias
16 Tamarisk Way
East Preston
BN16 2TF

22nd July 2015

Objection to **EP/78/15/HH 14 Tamarisk Way**
Front Extension To Form Attached Double Garage

We would like to object to the above Planning Application because we consider that it will still conflict with policies GEN7 (iv) and DEV19 (iii).

Recent related Applications

This is the third application Mr T Grange, our neighbour at No. 14, has made for planning permission to build an additional garage in front of his existing garage.

His first application in April 2014 (EP/61/14/HH) was for a double garage with bedroom above. This was refused by ADC on 13th June 2014 because of " ... the unacceptable harmful effect on No. 16 Tamarisk Way ..". The subsequent appeal to the Planning Inspectorate was dismissed on 30th January 2015.

His second application in February 2015 (EP/26/15/HH) was for a double garage but without the bedroom above. This reduced the overall height but not the length or it being built up to the boundary. This too was refused by ADC on 23rd April 2015 because of " ... the unacceptable harmful effect on No. 16 Tamarisk Way ..". This decision was not appealed.

Comparison with Previous Application

The current application proposes a further reduction in the roof height (unspecified) - but not in the height of the eaves, a reduction in length to 4.5 metres but no change in the width, "it would still be situated on the boundary without any separation distance".

Residential Amenity

The extension is still to be built up to the Eastern boundary of our property adjacent to our patio and perpendicular to the rear elevation to our property which has a ground floor window, in close proximity of the boundary, that serves our kitchen. Although the extension has been reduced in length and a little more in height; when viewed from our kitchen the proposal would still have an overbearing impact because the reduction in length would not change how much of extension will be visible from the kitchen. Similarly when using the patio the reduced length of the extension would still be 4.5 metres adjacent to the most used part of the patio (i.e. not next to the rear wall of our house) and would still contribute to an adverse sense of enclosure, thereby causing harm to our amenity.

Whilst the reduction in length and height in this proposal is a small improvement, because the extension is still to be built almost on our boundary it is not possible to mitigate or soften its impact on our living conditions. I believe that the only way to mitigate the harmful effect on our amenity is to re-site the extension approximately one metre away from the boundary and for the applicant to plant a continuation of the hedge along the side of the extension. This soft landscaping would soften the visual and overbearing effect of the extension and thereby reduce its harmful impact on our amenity.

(We are attempting to "hide" the previous extension which is built right on the boundary, and overhangs our property, by growing bushes in the ground adjacent to it. However, in the case of the proposed extension we have no ground adjacent to it so the planting needs to be on the applicant's property.)

Summary

According to the Planning Inspectorate: "The thrust of one of the core planning principles within the (National Planning Policy) Framework is that planning should always seek to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings."

The development as proposed would still therefore conflict with ADC's Local Plan policy GEN7(iv) which states that any new development should not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers.

We do not consider that the small additional reduction in height and in length have sufficiently addressed the previous reasons for ADC's refusal.

As we believe the main consideration in determining this application is the effect on the residential amenity of No.16, we would respectfully request that ADC as the LPO reject this revised application for permission on the same basic grounds as before which used the arguments given by ADC's Planning Officer supported by the comments of the Planning Inspector.

Mr and Mrs G E Mathias

Should the Planning Officer wish to view the site of the proposed extension from our property we would welcome this. If we are not present, access can be obtained by walking down the West side of our house and going on to the patio from where the site can be easily seen.

From your files you are aware of the documents relating to the previous applications. However, I list below the reasons given for previous decisions.

The ADC Planning Officer's reason for refusal was:

"The front extension by virtue of its height, length and proximity to the western boundary will have an unacceptable harmful overbearing effect on No. 16 Tamarisk Way in conflict with policies GEN 7 (iv) and DEV 19 (iii) of ADC's Local Plan and Policy D DM 4 of the Emerging Local Plan."

The Planning Inspector's reason for dismissal of the appeal was:

"I find the proposed development would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 16 Tamarisk Way with particular reference to outlook and daylight."