

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Malcolm Jenkins [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2019 16:10
To: Andrew Wood
Subject: Planning Application FG/220/18/PL : Land adjacent to Elm Lodge, Tamarisk Way, Ferring, West Sussex

Dear Andrew,

**PLANNING APPLICATION FG/220/18/PL:
LAND ADJACENT TO ELM LODGE, TAMARISK WAY, FERRING, WEST SUSSEX BN12 5ER**

Further to our telephone conversation on Thursday 4th April, thank you for taking the time to talk through the application with me. It is most appreciated.

As discussed, we have produced the additional information below and in the attached PDF 'Additional Supporting Documentation' which we hope will be helpful to you in preparing your report before a decision is made.

1. PLOT SIZE AND DENSITY

Below is a table showing the site areas and building footprint areas of all properties in Tamarisk Way. The density calculation is a ratio of footprint area to site area and illustrates the proportion of each site currently occupied by its buildings.

ADDRESS	SITE AREA (SQM)	FOOTPRINT AREA (SQM)	DENSITY (%)
MAGALIA, TAMARISK WAY	688	154	22.4%

1 TAMARISK WAY	441	124	28.1%
2 TAMARISK WAY	490	120	24.4%
3 TAMARISK WAY	732	154	21.0%
4 TAMARISK WAY	596	157	26.3%
5A TAMARISK WAY	323	139	43.2%
5 TAMARISK WAY	346	123	35.5%
6 TAMARISK WAY	351	135	38.4%
7 TAMARISK WAY	431	106	24.5%
8 TAMARISK WAY	414	99	23.8%
9 TAMARISK WAY	414	104	25.1%
AVERAGE	475	129	28.4%
ELM LODGE (AS EXISTING)	1006	129	12.8%
ELM LODGE (APPROVAL FG/186/18/HH)	1006	144	14.3%
PROPOSED NEW DWELLING	495	136	27.4%
ELM LODGE (REMAINING HOUSE)	511	116	22.8%

As demonstrated above, both the proposed new dwelling and the remaining house will retain site areas that are larger than average for the rest of Tamarisk Way, and larger than all plots located on the north side of Tamarisk Way.

The average density on Tamarisk Way is 28.4%. The average density on the north side of Tamarisk Way is 31.7%. Both the proposed new dwelling and the remaining house will have densities lower than the average for Tamarisk Way, at 27.4% and 22.8% respectively.

We have also produced a comparison of the properties which are on or adjacent to Sea Lane as below, which show that the density of the proposed new dwelling (27.4%) is also commensurate with these sites (averaging 27.9%):

ADDRESS	SITE AREA (SQM)	FOOTPRINT AREA (SQM)	DENSITY (%)
56 SEA LANE	804	206	25.7%
58 SEA LANE	364	101	27.7%
2 LABURNUM COURT	259	129	49.7%
1 LABURNUM COURT	452	145	32.0%
60 SEA LANE	435	136	31.2%
68 SEA LANE	647	132	20.4%
70 SEA LANE	661	150	22.7%
51 BEEHIVE LANE	671	200	29.9%
72 SEA LANE	659	201	30.5%
74 SEA LANE	566	166	29.3%
76 SEA LANE	1175	252	21.4%
78 SEA LANE	724	130	17.9%
MAGALIA, TAMARISK WAY	688	154	22.4%
80 SEA LANE	605	132	21.8%

25 SOMERSET ROAD	732	157	21.4%
82 SEA LANE	429	159	37.1%
84 SEA LANE	433	142	32.9%
AVERAGE			27.9%
ELM LODGE (AS EXISTING)	1006	129	12.8%
ELM LODGE (APPROVAL FG/186/18/HH)	1006	144	14.3%
PROPOSED NEW DWELLING	495	136	27.4%

Finally, the same study has been undertaken for the closest 50 properties on roads adjoining Sea Lane, which again shows the density of the proposed new dwelling and the remaining house are below the average density for the area:

ADDRESS	SITE AREA (SQM)	FOOTPRINT AREA (SQM)	DENSITY (%)
43 BEEHIVE LANE	490	121	24.8%
45 BEEHIVE LANE	479	129	26.8%
47 BEEHIVE LANE	996	182	18.3%
49 BEEHIVE LANE	679	142	20.9%
51 BEEHIVE LANE	671	200	29.9%
46 BEEHIVE LANE	563	135	24.0%
48 BEEHIVE LANE	747	169	22.6%
52 BEEHIVE LANE	684	207	30.2%
54 BEEHIVE LANE	772	177	22.9%
56 BEEHIVE LANE	550	169	30.7%
58 BEEHIVE LANE	505	169	33.5%
60 BEEHIVE LANE	758	211	27.8%
62 BEEHIVE LANE	373	143	38.2%
72 SEA LANE	659	201	30.5%
74 SEA LANE	566	166	29.3%
3 BEEHIVE CLOSE	721	201	27.9%
2 BEEHIVE CLOSE	669	160	24.0%
34 SOMERSET ROAD	379	145	38.4%
1 BEEHIVE CLOSE	546	142	26.1%
76 SEA LANE	1175	252	21.4%
30 SOMERSET ROAD	366	123	33.5%
78 SEA LANE	724	130	17.9%
5A TAMARISK WAY	323	139	43.2%
5 TAMARISK WAY	346	123	35.5%
6 TAMARISK WAY	351	135	38.4%
7 TAMARISK WAY	431	106	24.5%
8 TAMARISK WAY	414	99	23.8%
9 TAMARISK WAY	414	104	25.1%
4 TAMARISK WAY	596	157	26.3%

3 TAMARISK WAY	732	154	21.0%
2 TAMARISK WAY	490	120	24.4%
1 TAMARISK WAY	441	124	28.1%
MAGALIA, TAMARISK WAY	688	154	22.4%
80 SEA LANE	605	132	21.8%
13 SOMERSET ROAD	510	125	24.5%
15 SOMERSET ROAD	809	142	17.6%
17 SOMERSET ROAD	467	161	34.4%
19 SOMERSET ROAD	657	142	21.6%
21 SOMERSET ROAD	1362	260	19.1%
23 SOMERSET ROAD	395	118	29.9%
25 SOMERSET ROAD	732	157	21.4%
24 SOMERSET ROAD	437	176	40.3%
26 SOMERSET ROAD	364	111	30.6%
28 SOMERSET ROAD	367	113	30.8%
32 SOMERSET ROAD	368	123	33.3%
36 SOMERSET ROAD	844	205	24.3%
38 SOMERSET ROAD	286	117	41.0%
82 SEA LANE	429	159	37.1%
84 SEA LANE	433	142	32.9%
AVERAGE			28.0%
ELM LODGE (AS EXISTING)	1006	129	12.8%
ELM LODGE (APPROVAL FG/186/18/HH)	1006	144	14.3%
PROPOSED NEW DWELLING	495	136	27.4%
ELM LODGE (REMAINING HOUSE)	511	116	22.8%

As such, we do not consider that the proposed dwelling would result in any form of overdevelopment on this site, given the proposed new dwelling and the remaining house will retain site areas that are larger-than-average for the rest of Tamarisk Way, with lower-than-average site densities in comparison to the surrounding properties. We feel that this information justifies our view that this Planning Application complies with Policy D SP1 and Policy D DM1.

Any objections regarding setting a precedent for other developments of this type can be disregarded as we have illustrated above that:

- There are no residential properties with suitably large gardens in the immediate surrounding area that can be developed in this way, as the density will become uncharacteristic.
- Our proposal falls in line with other developments in the broader area in terms of provision of a suitably sized site per unit.

2. DESIGN AND CHARACTER

We have now taken the time to review the further correspondence received and we would consider revising our design as below if you feel that it would benefit the application:

- Glazing to the front elevation has been reduced significantly in the attached PDF 'Additional Supporting Documentation' by removing the apex glazing and sidelights to now provide a single pair of french doors, reflecting the character of the neighbouring approval for Elm Lodge.
- Although habitable rooms are well in excess of 21m apart to prevent any loss of privacy or sunlight, all first floor inset dormer balconies with french doors will be removed and replaced with windows to the dormers to minimise any perceived visual intrusion, as shown in the attached PDF 'Additional Supporting Documentation'.

These changes will help further harmonise the proposed new dwelling with the approved design of Elm Lodge (FG/186/18/HH) and ensure it sits sympathetically within the street scene. Should you wish for us to revise the Planning Application drawings to reflect these potential alterations, then we would be happy to do so.

Our justification for why we do not consider the proposed new dwelling to adversely impact the character of the area is included in the attached PDF 'Additional Supporting Documentation'. We have also included the already submitted drawing 696/PLAPA - Proposed Local Area Plan within our supporting document as this demonstrates how the proposed new dwelling sits well behind the Sea Lane and Tamarisk Way building lines, and emulates a similar setback from Sea Lane as the nearby corner plots. There are multiple prominent single, two storey and three storey dwellings located on corner plots along Sea Lane situated in positions similar to the proposed dwelling, many with little architectural merit, which characterise the local area. Our visualisations compared to photographs of corner plots along Sea Lane show that the aspect of our site will still remain far more 'open' than many other plots along Sea Lane, and the new dwelling merely emulates the existing pattern of development.

3. IMPACT ON REMAINING HOUSE

As explained in the attached PDF 'Additional Supporting Documentation', the windows on Elm Lodge that will face the proposed new dwelling are small, non-principal windows. As such, there will be minimal impact to Elm Lodge in terms of privacy and outlook. Daylighting analysis has also been undertaken which shows that there will be no loss of sunlight to Elm Lodge resulting from the proposed new dwelling, at any time of the year. We feel that this information justifies our view that this Planning Application complies with Policy D DM1.

4. CONCLUSION

We understand that the key issues affecting the determination of this application are the 'character of the area' and 'impact on the existing dwelling', and hope that the additional information attached provides you with comprehensive evidence to show that the application complies with Arun Local Plan Policy D SP1 and Policy D DM1.

Given NPPF's presumption is in favour of sustainable development, we do not consider the proposed new dwelling would have an adverse impact on the character of the area or existing dwelling that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of residential development on this site.

We now feel that we have submitted enough information with this Application for the Council to recommend approval, however should there be any further queries, then please do not hesitate to contact us so that such matters can be resolved as quickly as possible.

In the meanwhile, we note that Peter and Ruth Sims claimed in their fifth objection letter on 25 March 2019 that our pond 'extends fully to the boundary wall on the NE corner of the plot'. This is untrue - please find attached photographs showing this corner of the pond which is a minimum of 1.3m away from the boundary. All drawings submitted with the application and topographical survey confirm the extent of the pond.

Kind regards,

Malcolm Jenkins
RIBA Chartered Architect

MALCOLM JENKINS ASSOCIATES



RIBA Chartered Architects



96-98 High Street
Shepperton
Middlesex
TW17 9AU

This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged information for the recipient only. Should you receive this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately and delete the message at once. You must not copy, distribute, disclose or take any action in reliance on it.

We endeavour to exclude viruses from our data but it is the obligation of the recipient to check any attachments for viruses.



Please consider the environment before printing this email