

Zac Denton

From: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 June 2019 12:51
To: Zac Denton
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent
Attachments: 25 degree rule A1.pdf; 45 degree rule A1.pdf; IMG_3673[1].JPG

Good afternoon Zac,

Firstly the client has confirmed that we agree to the extension of time until 19th June.

Secondly, as requested I have attached 2 plans showing the 45 and 25 degree rules of thumb. You will note that there are 4 windows on the neighbours southern boundary and I have numbered these W1 – W4. These windows serve the following:-

W1 – Small southern window to the side of the living room – a 6ft fence is located approx. 1m away from this window. The living room also includes a 4m wide x 1.45m high window to the west elevation.

W2 – Small southern window which serves the kitchen – similar to W1, a 6ft fence is located approx. 1m away from this window. The kitchen is linked the rear extension which has 4 windows and patio doors.

W3/W4 – These windows form part of an extension to the rear which is linked to the kitchen. The extension has triple aspect windows, 4 in total with a set of patio doors.

45 degree rule

This is usually used for extensions that are constructed at the rear of a semi-detached or terraced dwelling. The 45 degree line is drawn from the centre line of a window that is perpendicular to the proposed extension. I have shown the 45 degree lines on the windows 1-4 as requested but as you can see the only new extension will be the porch which is 2.6m away. I don't believe the new works will have any impact using this rule.

25 degree rule

Please note that the client, since moving in, has cleared a vast amount of vegetation on the northern boundary and intends to replace the existing 1.8m fence as this is in a very poor condition. We are aware that a 2m fence can be erected without planning consent.

As stated above, there are 4 windows on the southern elevation of No.24. The extension to the rear has triple aspect openings and therefore we believe the new works will have limited impact on this room. The front living room is also served by a very large window facing west so we would consider the worst case scenario would be the potential impact on window W2. I have therefore attached a drawing showing the distances between No.24 and the proposed new work. I have also included 3 sectional elevations marked A-C and would like to explain each as follows:-

- A. The closest extension to W2 is the proposed porch which is directly opposite. This section confirms that the 25 degree line will miss the height of the new extension.
- B. The 2-storey element will be positioned towards the rear and therefore the measurement from W2 to the centre of these works will be angled as shown. This measurement is 6.5m. Section B shows that the 25 degree line will miss this raised height of the roof through this angled line.

C. We have mentioned above that the rear extension to No.24 has triple aspect windows. W4 will be closest to the 2-storey element of the works but as section C shows, the existing dwelling and the fence already block the 25 degree line. Although the proposal is to raise the height of the roof we feel the neighbours extension is sufficiently served by several existing windows. The attached photograph shows the existing fence line and windows 1-4 on the southern elevation of No.24. A new fence will be erected along the boundary to replace the lower existing fence that is currently adjacent to W4 and the trellis adjacent to W1 and W2.

I should be very grateful if you could have a look at the attached drawings with your Team Leader and let me know if any further information is required.

Kind regards

Carl
Atterbury Moore Associates

From: Zac Denton [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 6, 2019 8:28 AM
To: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Good Morning Carl,

I am sorry to be asking for this so late in the application stage. My Team Leader has raised concerns relating to loss of light to the lower windows (on the extension) of the dwelling to the North. Would you be able to provide a plan showing a 45° & 25° angle light test?

Would you be agreeable to an Extension of Time until the 19th of June?

Kind regards,

Zac

From: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 June 2019 16:08
To: Zac Denton
Subject: RE: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Thank you for your message Zac.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

Kind regards

Carl

From: Zac Denton [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Dear Mr Moore,

Thank you for your emails.

I am hoping that the application will be decided by Friday, although thank you for the offer of an Extension of Time, we will have to see how it goes!

Kind regards,

Zac

[REDACTED]

From: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 June 2019 15:55
To: Zac Denton
Subject: FW: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Good afternoon Zac,

I understand from the client that the decision date is due on Friday. Please could you let me know if you have any thoughts about the current application or if you would like an extension of time. It would be good to know your thoughts before the decision is made.

Many thanks

Carl Moore
Allerbury Moore Associates

From: Carl Moore
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 2:45 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Hi Zac,

Sorry to chase but the client has contacted me again. I'm just about to leave my office but if you could come back to me on Monday then that would be very much appreciated.

Have a good weekend.

Kind regards

Carl

From: Carl Moore
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:43 PM
To: 'Zac Denton' [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Good afternoon Zac,

Have you had a chance to look at the application? I am aware that we only have a couple of weeks left and the client is very keen to find out your thoughts before making any decisions. Any help would be much appreciated.

Kind regards

Carl
Atterbury Moore Associates

From: Zac Denton [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 3:40 PM
To: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Dear Carl,

Thank you for your email. I have organised for it to be scanned against the application, I will try and keep you updated on this application!

Kind regards,

Zac

From: Carl Moore [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 May 2019 10:24
To: Zac Denton
Subject: FG/42/19/HH - 22 Singleton Crescent

Good morning Zac,

Hope you are well.

I am contacting you with regard to the current planning application for various proposals at 22 Singleton Crescent in Ferring. I understand that you visited the property recently and spoke to the client.

Firstly can I say that the client approached all of the neighbours prior to the application and has continued to speak to them about the proposals throughout this process.

You will note that we have had several objections to the application. I also note the suggestions that I may have in some way mislead you and the public, although reading my statements again I believe these are all true. I would like to take this opportunity to summarise the objections and comment on each item as follows:-

Street scene / out of character

Singleton Crescent is a 1960's development and has a varied mixture of bungalows. There is no defined type of dwelling and there is no uniformity within the existing street scene. There are many various features and materials that have been used and all of the roof heights appear to differ. Many of the bungalows within the crescent have converted roofs, these are now deemed to be chalet bungalows. Many of the objections refer to the proposals as a 2-storey house but this is not the case as I'm sure you will note.

The client would like to convert the loft space of the existing bungalow to provide a third bedroom, however due to the height of the ridge this will be impossible without raising the height. The client has always been very keen to retain the character of the existing street scene and therefore felt it was necessary to replicate the existing style of dwellings directly opposite and located in various positions around the Crescent. This includes numbers 28 and 30 which are just north of No.22. Therefore we disagree with Mr Millers view that the proposals will be a 'grotesque intrusion' of the harmony of the existing bungalows. We feel the use of barn hips and matching the style of the existing dwellings mentioned will enhance the street scene and will certainly not look out of character.

Car Parking

There is sufficient off-street car parking for the dwelling. Adding one additional bedroom will not have a severe impact of traffic within the village centre of Ferring.

Overlooking

As I have stated above many dwellings within the Crescent have converted their loft space under PD. This is now common place and other dwellings adjacent to No.22 will have the benefit of converting their lofts if they wish to do so (for example No.20 could convert the loft space as the ridge height is higher). Unfortunately due to the ridge height at No.22 this is unachievable. You will note that No.28 received planning approval to convert their loft and construct a large rear dormer. This is noted on the plans which shows the type of dormer we are proposing.

Loss of daylight

The client has always been very conscious of the impact the proposals may have on the neighbours and this is the reason they spoke with them prior to the planning application. We acknowledge and respect the comments made by No. 24 and accept that this neighbour is the only one that can have concerns as they are due north of the proposal. You will note from the front elevation that we have consciously introduced the barn hip at the top of the existing ridge height in order to avoid any further vertical obstruction (see red line showing existing roof line). As requested by No.24 the client would be willing to clad the dormer with a light grey colour similar to the dormer at No.28. We would be happy to agree this under condition.

I should be very grateful if you would consider these points I have raised and then provide me with your thoughts at your earliest convenience. As I have mentioned, the client is keen to retain a relationship with the neighbour and to limit the impact the proposals may have.

Your assistance would be much appreciated.

Kind regards

Carl Moore
Atterbury Moore Associates

