

Dear Andrew

Thank you for taking the time to speak to me last week.

We attach a detailed list of objections to the above planning application which is a revised application of FG/186/18/PL and FG/220/18/PL. The latter application was refused by Arun District Council on the grounds that the new dwelling would have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, including the host dwelling in terms of loss of light, overbearing impacts and loss of privacy, contrary to policy D DM1 (3) of the Arun Local Plan. The appellant's appeal was dismissed by HM Inspectorate on the grounds of 'the harmful overbearing impact on the occupiers of the host property and harmful loss of privacy to the occupiers of Magalia, contrary to policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan.

It seems to us that the new proposal in application FG/141/19/PL makes only minor changes to the proposed property. Our objections remain as follows -

1. Alterations to South facing windows using obscure glass with non-operable windows does not guarantee long term privacy. We strongly suspect that it would only be a matter of time before current or future owners revise the room layout and replace windows with clear openable glass windows.
2. Since no further relocation of the proposed property appears possible, its proximity to the drainage channel, pond and west side boundary fence (only 1.5m from the host property) remain unresolved. Many previous objectors have identified this as being unacceptable, citing a cramped, overdeveloped and unneighbourly use of space, contrary to D DM1.
3. We would contend that notwithstanding the proposed window alterations, the sheer size of the proposed property would dominate the street scene of Tamarisk Way and its surrounds. The Inspectorate drew clear attention to the proposed property's impact on Magalia in particular and was a major reason for the appeal's dismissal.
4. This is a new application and consequently we would draw attention to the threat of flooding from the surface water drainage pond, as we and others have previously indicated. Although the pond can become dry in periods of drought, it is (as it is currently) full during periods of rainfall and can overflow in times of heavy rain. We understand that ADC engineers required pond levels to be monitored through 2019/2020.

The reasons for objection are many and varied but fundamentally remain unchanged from those expressed on the previous applications. We would suggest that Mr and Mrs Jenkins have failed to provide reasons for ADC Planning Dept. to come to different views from those previously held and we would ask you to refuse the application again.