

1 Ocean Parade

Ferring

BN12 5QQ

31.07.18

Amber Willard, Juan Baeza, Zac Denton

Arun District Council

Planning Dept

Arun Civic Centre

LETTER OF OBJECTION

Maltravers Road

Littlehampton

Dear Amber, Juan and Zac

FG/116/18/HH 2 OCEAN DRIVE FERRING BN12 5QJ, OBJECTION LETTER AND PHOTOS

These plans are certainly not pretty and definitely won't win any awards for classy architectural design, which is a great opportunity missed. Technically the design is flawed and contains serious errors, omissions and mistakes in the drawings. In particular the proximity and layout and design of surrounding neighbouring properties, their windows and their gardens and rear access footpath to properties in Ocean Parade have not been taken into account or disclosed in the plans.

The height of the new roof increases the roof height up to a monumental one and half storeys high with overlooking windows, currently there are none. There is a distinct lack of boundary on both sides, the distance from the boundary on the North West elevation is very small, only 802mm. The location of the existing windows at 1 Ocean Parade and 4 Ocean Drive were strangely not made clear or taken into consideration in the plans and as a result these neighbours are seriously compromised to a huge extent. The dual aspect lounge windows in particular of the first floor apartment at 1 Ocean Parade were entirely ignored and the 45 degree rule has also been ignored. In addition the topography of the land has also been ignored and not taken into account and as a result it explains why when you look at the incredible scale of the dormer roof in the plans the towering size of it becomes even more apparent. This creates a tunnelling effect on the neighbours which is made worse by the fact that this plan builds all the way along the garden boundary line on the North West elevation, to the utter detriment on the neighbouring properties and gardens in Ocean Parade. It also creates a very bad tunnelling effect on 4 Ocean Drive.

What is also not made clear in the plans is that the bungalow at 2 Ocean Drive is set a long way back from the road, meaning that the gardens of residential properties in Ocean Parade

are actually immediately adjacent to the bungalow at 2 Ocean Drive. As a result the plans are immediately placed into conflict with the properties and gardens of the residential properties in Ocean Parade, and number 1 and number 2 in particular, as the plans for the dormer roof for 2 Ocean Drive are directly in line with the gardens of Ocean Parade. The dominance of the plan is therefore overbearing and oppressive. It is an unneighbourly plan littered and fraught with serious technical mistakes, omissions, inaccuracies and flaws.

My critic on the design is that aesthetically it is totally void of any finesse, attractive features and lines. This is an enormous industrial scale dormer. It is simply plonked on top of the existing bungalow on such a ridiculously large scale resulting in a complete imbalance in relation to the existing bungalow, the surroundings, the neighbouring bungalow at number 4 Ocean Drive and the quiet attractive mews style residential properties and gardens in Ocean Parade and the wider neighbouring area. This unneighbourly plan ruins and spoils the living conditions of neighbours, it takes away ambience, takes away light currently enjoyed and takes away privacy currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties and gardens but also and ironically it has a crushing negative result on number 2 Ocean Drive as well. It is a self-inflicted architectural own goal which will adversely impact on 2 Ocean Drive itself hugely. The plan, is ill conceived, it is over the top, unattractive, over kill, and a backward step, it will a blot on the landscape. In a day and age where the buzz phrase is “ environmentally friendly “ this the opposite, it rubs very abrasively against all aspects of this ideal and it is surprising that this plan has even been submitted. This plan is a retrograde step, it's old fashioned, dated looking in every way, it is not cool, it is going in the wrong direction, lacking in foresight, it results in something worse, something threatening and suffocating, something unpleasant and undesirable to be near or look at, resulting in the fact that it is not environmentally friendly in the slightest. Quite the reverse applies.

The description of the plan, “ loft conversion “ is also wrong, this is not a loft conversion it is a roof lobotomy. In truth, it is turning an attractive sought after pretty bungalow currently full of charm and character into a super ugly hybrid house, and at the expense of the neighbours. It is a back door attempt to build a house using a low budget uninspiring plan, lacking in vision and class and will not work. It is basically putting a massively oversized one and half storey box on the existing roof line to the complete detriment of the neighbours. It is therefore wrong to use the term loft conversion in the application, this is not a loft conversion, the description is incorrect. The definition of a loft conversion is, the process of transforming an empty loft or attic space into functional rooms or storage space. This plan exceeds this definition by miles. The boundaries have been over stepped massively and the host roof entirely ignored and disregarded.

This plan would result in a hideous eyesore and needs to go back to the drawing board and be completely revisited in every way by a planner and architect that is experienced, well versed and properly suited to this locality. Someone tuned to the environment and landscape, someone who has vision and understands the value in a really great plan to enhance this property and surrounding area. Someone who cares. Someone who can draw up a fantastic neighbourly plan to be proud of, not this diabolical idea. I recommend to take a look around Ferring at the very best extensions that merge seamlessly into the environment and landscape to get some much better ideas.

This the plan is a very sad contribution to the area, currently it is combination of the Berlin Wall and a pre fab style 70's tower block. To inflict a ghastly bodge on the neighbours and the environment and even the applicant is not right.

A note also worth mentioning is that the applicant did not consult any of the neighbours prior to submitting this plan. Surely the neighbourly thing to do is to consult those around you?

I ask that you completely reject this plan. Please dedicate your talents, your ambitions, your ideals and your creative spirit and technical abilities to encourage the creation of an alternative beautiful plan, a plan to be proud of. An environmentally attractive plan that creates a sense of wellbeing and harmony for the applicant and the neighbours. Why can't we have that? A plan that harmonises the whole locality, not a selfish plan that cause's friction and discord but a plan that is applauded for its brilliance, a plan that makes it an even better and a nicer place to live and enjoy for everyone, a plan that enhances and improves lives and living conditions for all. Surely that is the right thing to do? This plan does not do any of those things for anyone. So what is the point of doing it?

Please refuse this plan on the grounds brought before you. Stop the madness. It is very bad and poorly conceived, it is ill thought out, it is flawed, it has technical mistake's too numerous to mention, it is unneighbourly and has a huge detrimental impact on other people's lives, the neighbouring properties and garden's. It is out of keeping and will change the visual and environmental scene in an extremely damaging way. It is a very very bad idea and terrible plan for us all and that includes the applicant.

Please help to make this a better place.

Yours sincerely

D Oliver

- Selection of 14 photos attached, (8 pages with photos attached) to this letter below.















