



From: MIKE MURRAY [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 June 2018 07:45
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: Re: Please find attached details of Planning decision on Application Ref: FG/42/18/HH

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning
Arun District Council

Referring to the above planning application decision.

I feel I must express my disappointment that your team made the decision to pass the above plans without amendment.

Neighbouring property owners all feel they will be materially affected by this huge, out of keeping development, towering in the street scene, and from the Rife countryside adjoining. We are all very upset, one person in particular feels he needs to move due to the loss of privacy and the new overburdening building. We all feel badly let down by you.

The remarks are so biased towards the applicant, clearly the officer, sees no value in the the views of local residents and Parish Council.

The process is so biased towards the applicant, there was no attempt to discuss the effect this large development would have on us. It seems every effort was made for the benefit of the applicant, who I may add has not even lived here for 6 months when started on the application. I understand your officer even had a private meeting with the applicants at their house, how can that be fair, when the locals (who will have to live with this monstrous development) don't get any representation. Three of us neighbours have over 35 years living in Ferring. Surely that has some value.

It is such a bias system.

How can anyone possibly write 'there is no demonstrable harm as a result of the development', this shows a lack of understanding of the site and mass of the proposal from the point of existing residents. The report admits there is a SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN ROOF MASS, for example

- Three of us will now loose between 15 and 30 minutes of direct sun light every evening.
- There will be a loss of sight of trees and vegetation from the front of properties,
- There will now be two new dormer windows looking onto bedrooms and lounges of three properties opposite.
- The sky will be completely obliterated from one of my lounge windows now.
- The enlarged parking area will have an adverse effect on street scene.
- Juliet windows/balcony will reduce privacy to neighbours property as will overlook garden.

I would like you to explain to me the 'Other Material Considerations' paragraph please. When it is written that the proposed extensions are not subservient, how it can be concluded there is no demonstrable harm to visual or residential amenity, when it is obvious looking at the plans and given the number of objections you received.

How it can be written that there is no harm is odd, you only have to compare the size of the proposed building to the vast majority of everything else around, add to that loss of space around the building and that it will be the largest and highest property along that part of the street.

The stand out comment, is the Highways and Parking paragraph, first there are 4 spaces, then there is not, then there is neutral impact. It was pointed out that the vehicles on the plans were in miniature form to make out the space was larger and to confuse, clearly that has worked. Simply 4 vehicles cannot fit on the space shown, it is a case of deception. What else has been missed?

I note the applicant states that the roof is going to be raised by approximately 1.2m, how high you will let him go, given the inaccuracy in parking spaces, 1.5 m, or 1.75 m or even 2.5m. How will this be policed?

Many of the comments are odd, given the enormous building that is proposed. it is strange to comment that the proposed build was in keeping with the local scene. This is going to be a very large house, there are no houses along that stretch of the road, there are only low rise bungalows, and ALL still the same height as originally built in the 1950's. This will tower over properties opposite and adjoining.

The comment 'not result in an unacceptable loss of space about building' is again factually so wrong. The roof is going to be 'approximately 1.2m' higher, the ridge 4 times as long, meaning the roof is going to be twice its current size. Such a huge area of sky to the above and sides of the building ARE GOING TO BE LOST. I am really mystified how that conclusion could be made.

The poor neighbour who has lived in that bungalow for over 15 years will now have to look at his new neighbour's property towering over his bungalow. He is so upset.

What has been done here is set a precedent for over development in the street and ruin many local people's peaceful retirement. The scene is now set for a 'terrace of houses' to be developed along the west side of the street. There is no point saying each application is looked at individually, as we all know, you have now set this precedence, the flood gates are open.

All it would have taken is a bit of common decency, respecting the local environment and residents by refusing to allow the raising of the roof by 1.2m, then new plans would not have resulted in the problems we now have. The applicant even gave you that 'get out' by admitting raising roofs are not looked at favourably. That's where the whole decision process has gone badly wrong for the local people.

I always thought you were there to protect the environment and local people, not allowing 'out of keeping developments', instead there appears to be a biased process leaning heavily towards outsiders to come in and destroying our many years of established lifestyle.

It is a real shame.

I do hope you will come back to the site once finished and see what has resulted. I really do not think you will feel this new building fits in at all with the remainder of the streets 1950's bungalows. I know it is all over now but hopefully something can be learnt here.

I only hope that in sending you this note it will make you stop and think for a moment and realise what you have done and how we feel about this. Maybe that's why we were not consulted. The social structure will now change and a great loss of classic 1950's retirement properties will be gone forever.

I realise it is easier for you to agree than challenge but that's what you should be doing, we rely on you to do this.

Finally, I read with interest the Human Rights Act part of the paper. I am not sure that 'right to respect private and family life' has been applied to the existing residents, at all.

Looks like we will now have to draw our curtains in our lounges and bedrooms early in the evenings to maintain our dignity and self respect. Do you have to do the same (rhetorical)?

Michael Murray
6 Foamcourt Waye,
Ferring
BN125RD

From: "planning.responses@arun.gov.uk" <planning.responses@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: Friday, 15 June 2018, 16:03

Subject: Please find attached details of Planning decision on Application Ref: FG/42/18/HH

To: M P Murray

**NOTIFICATION FROM ARUN DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION FG/42/18/HH
NO:

Site 17 Foamcourt Waye Ferring BN12 5RD
Address:

Grid Reference:

Category: Householder

Description of Works: Demolition of existing detached garage & rear conservatory, enlargement of existing driveway, single storey side extensions, extension of existing roof over proposed extensions with 5 No. dormer windows.

I refer to your representations in connection with this proposal and am able to inform you that after careful consideration by the Council a decision has been made.

[Click here to view
the decision](#)

The officer who dealt with this application was Pat Aird who can be contacted on telephone number 01903 737643.

Thank you for your interest

pmac22_email

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
