

4. Ocean Drive
South Ferring
West Sussex
BN12 5QJ

Planning Department,
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

1st.August 2018

OBJECTION to planning Application Number FG/116/18/HH
Address of property:- No. 2 Ocean Drive, South Ferring

Written by David White (Power of Attorney) on behalf of the owner and occupier of No 4. Ocean Drive his sister Miss Margaret Gilean White.

The application

The application appears to be for a change from a bungalow No. 2 Ocean Drive which is a twin in size shape and style to No.4, to a 2 storey dwelling which will considerably overshadow its neighbours.

Effect on the level of daylight and privacy of existing property

The proposed alteration to this property takes scant regard for the close proximity of No.4.

There is a current gap of c.1.4m - eave to eave and even less if gutters are taken into account. This suggests in planning terms that there is almost no gap between the dwellings.

The current matching bungalow pitched roof angles, allow light on No 2's North facing wall, where there are 6 windows. Bedroom, Hall, Bathroom (2) and Kitchen(2).

The proposed alterations will provide a very tall sidewall block, visually unattractive and disturbing, and will considerably reduce the light available for those 6 windows.

The proposed west facing first floor window and balcony will directly over look No.4's garden depriving the occupier of privacy previously enjoyed.

Access Route

There is a very long narrow path bordering No. 2 and adjacent to No. 4 to a side entrance, which already has a tunnel effect. The proposed sidewall will greatly worsen this effect.

Local Area and Street scene

The overall design of this proposal as been made with little concern for planning style and is out of keeping with and will visually impact on the street presentation of the local area.

Conclusion

I am objecting to the proposal on behalf of my sister.

Clearly No 2. and No 4. were built as a pair of bungalows with their pitched roofs very close at the eaves and the level of light available across the boundary between the properties is fulfilled because of the pitch of the roofs. Presumably planning for a bungalow and a 2 storey property would have been unlikely to be granted. Any alterations of the kind made by this proposal will severely restrict this light.

These properties are a pretty pair of bungalows and the 2 storey proposal will undoubtedly spoil their visual aspect from the road and the overall local Ferring street scene.

David White