

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Stephen Milliner [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 September 2020 09:04
To: Zac Denton [REDACTED] lanning [REDACTED]
Subject: EP/96/20/HH Little Dormers 23 Upper Drive BN16 1QN - Objection

Dear Mr Denton

I am aware the Planning department rely heavily on applicant's and their agents being factual and accurate in the information they submit when making a planning application so may I draw your attention to a number of inaccuracies in the information that has been submitted.

The applicant's agent has certified at section 12 of the application form that nobody other than the applicant is the owner of the land/buildings that the application refers to. This is not correct. The Angmering on Sea Estate verges are generally not in the ownership of the individual dwelling owners with the land occupied by verges and crossovers in front of each dwelling together with the Estate roads being owned by Angmering on Sea Estate Residents Association. The applicant does not own the verge at the front of the property which is currently a hard cross over between Upper Drive and their land at 23 Upper Drive. To assist I enclose a copy of the official Land registry title drawing for 23 Upper Drive which clearly shows the verge/crossover is not within the ownership of the applicant. I am acutely aware of the legal ramifications of any inaccuracies in this section of the application and thought it prudent to notify you of this matter. In addition, if an applicant wishes to include land which is not under their ownership in a planning application then I believe an Article 13 notice must be issued to the actual land owners. I cannot see any such correspondence on the planning portal.

Just for clarity it is the very front section of the development (east side) which the applicant does not own but which the applicant has included within the application (within the red line on both the site plan drawing 203075/05 and the Location Plan and Block plan drawing 203075/06).

The applicant has defined the space at the very north east of the existing dwelling on the plan submitted as a dining room. This is not the case and the space is a garage. I enclose photographic evidence to confirm this and I believe the existing elevation shows the garage door.

The East Elevation on the proposed drawing is inaccurate and possibly an attempt by Fuller Associates to mislead you. The East elevation shows the proposed new garage as a dotted line. What is drawn is not what you will see as it generally shows the elevation as unchanged when in fact the elevation will change significantly. A dotted line should be shown when something is hidden and the drawing needs to be amended so it is accurate and defines exactly what the new proposed east elevation will appear like with the hidden part of the existing dwelling in dotted line format behind the garage. Once this drawing is resubmitted then local residents and the general public should be given adequate opportunity/time to review the correct drawing. Having reviewed the other drawings for the garage I can visualise what is proposed and my own view is that the street view will be horrendous with a blank flank wall immediately adjacent to the highway road/verge. Upper Drive is an eclectic mixture of residential buildings, low in height plus set back from the highway and the proposal significantly derogates the existing visual amenity.

The proposals do not meet the requirements of the East Preston neighbourhood Plan Policy 2: Design in Character Area One, which Upper Drive falls within. This policy requires the development to preserve the street scene and avoid an increase in density that would alter the character of the area.

The East Preston Neighbourhood Plan policy 2 also states the existing street scene should be protected and the construction of high front walls or fences should be resisted. It then sets out that the character of the area is largely created by the green appearance of the roads which should be preserved.

The proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy D DM4 which states that extensions and alterations which are visible on the street-scene should respect the established spatial character and pattern of the street, and make a positive contribution to the locality. Policy D DM4 also requires any extension to demonstrate that through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance to be designed to respect the property and its surroundings and be distinctive of the wider setting. The proposal is aggressive in scale at the front of the site and does not meet the requirements of planning policy.

The new double garage front extension will be very close to the boundary of 25 Upper Drive and significantly block the view/transparency between buildings that currently exists. Such a transparent view between buildings is an integral part of the character of the Angmering on Sea Estate often described as the green garden estate.

The four-bedroom house currently has hard standing across the complete frontage of the site together with a garage in the NE corner of the dwelling. This proposal desires the existing garage to be kept as a garage,

supplemented with a further large double garage in front which means that the access arrangements for vehicles will be impaired and the space in front of the proposed garage will be needed to gain access to the proposed garage. I am minded that these proposals therefore mean the remaining hard standing cannot be meaningfully used as onsite parking spaces and the actual parking space provisions for the development are being reduced. Upper Drive is a very narrow road and double shuffling vehicles in this narrow road could be dangerous and annoying. In addition, as access to the existing garage will need to be through the new proposed extension this also limits the practical use of the proposed extension.

There is a new window proposed at first floor on the south elevation within bedroom 2 which I suspect is likely to cause overlooking issues to the dwelling to the south of the development (21 Upper Drive). This is in conflict with policy D DM4

The positioning of the red line on an application for planning beyond the land ownership line is often a ploy to show the site massing at a lower level than it really is. This may be something you could consider.

The street scene will be detrimentally changed and there will now be a massive lump in someone's front garden spoiling the immediate front view but also the open view from the north of Upper Drive/South View and also from Manor Road.

The residents of 25 Upper Drive will have their front garden view derogated with a new relatively high garage immediately adjacent to their property and for just about the complete length of their front garden. This has a material impact on their visual amenity and I am minded the extent and height of the proposed development may have a daylight/sunlight impact on this dwelling. The proposed garage will be overpowering causing overshadowing of the adjacent property. Policy D DM44 requires an extension not to be overpowering and overshadow neighbouring properties and as such the proposal does not meet the requirements of D DM44.

I see the proposal has two garage doors on the new extension. This might be for access to the retained garage but there is a fear that these two doors could be open for significant periods of time and the garage used as a repair facility rather than for standard residential night time garaging of a motor vehicle. This could lead to a further derogation of the visual amenity plus noise nuisance. It would be a shame if a workshop appearance is presented on a leafy residential road. Similarly, if the west facing garage door is open the occupants of 25 Upper Drive will be looking in to a garage when the west door is open rather than the leafy street scene they currently enjoy.

The covered open sided link connection between the existing garage and the new garage combined with the location of the new garage is likely to cause a wind tunnel effect and southerly winds are likely to cause increased wind speeds at the frontage of 25 Upper Drive. This effect can be very disconcerting particularly for elderly people and in some instances completely intolerable.

I trust the above observations are of assistance and would ask that the planning department refuse the application. If however, the Council is minded to approve the application could I request the following:

That those parts of the proposal shown as garage space are used for garage/parking space only in perpetuity and any permitted development rights for the new development are extinguished. This is to avoid a change of use to further living accommodation increasing the likelihood of offsite parking.

That the overlooking issues are dealt with in a manner consistent with other planning applications and obscure glass/non opening windows adopted to a suitable height to prevent such overlooking.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Milliner
2 South View
East Preston
Littlehampton
BN16 1PX

H.M. LAND REGISTRY		TITLE NUMBER	
		WSX71503	
ORDNANCE SURVEY PLAN REFERENCE	TQ0701	SECTION F	Scale 1:1250
COUNTY WEST SUSSEX	DISTRICT ARUN	© Crown copyright 1977	



This is a copy of the title plan on 12 SEP 2020 at 12:35:05. This copy does not take account of any application made after that time even if still pending in HM Land Registry when this copy was issued.

This copy is not an 'Official Copy' of the title plan. An official copy of the title plan is admissible in evidence in a court to the same extent as the original. A person is entitled to be indemnified by the registrar if he or she suffers loss by reason of a mistake in an official copy. If you want to obtain an official copy, the HM Land Registry web site explains how to do this.

HM Land Registry endeavours to maintain high quality and scale accuracy of title plan images. The quality and accuracy of any print will depend on your printer, your computer and its print settings. This title plan shows the general position, not the exact line, of the boundaries. It may be subject to distortions in scale. Measurements scaled from this plan may not match measurements between the same points on the ground.

This title is dealt with by HM Land Registry, Durham Office.

© Crown Copyright. Produced by HM Land Registry. Further reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the prior written permission of Ordnance Survey. Licence Number 100026316.

