

Watersedge
Florida Road
Ferring
West Sussex
BN12 5PE

[Date]

Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Street
Littlehampton
BN175LF

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: Planning Application: FG/97/21/HH 4 Florida Close, Ferring, West Sussex, BN125PF

We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposed development 4 Florida Close, Ferring, West Sussex, BN12 5PF, As an immediate neighbour to the site of the property proposed for planning permission, we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our privacy & impact us more broadly in a number of ways. Our specific objections are as follows:

1. Integrity of the proposed planning application in terms of the description of works.

Having reviewed all of the documents submitted with the planning application, we believe the information supplied to be incorrect, in particular as part of the application / approval, the claim that approval is being sought for a loft extension. The planning application details "Erection of front and rear extension, loft conversion and detached garage" In reality this is a full rebuild of the existing property. The current dwelling is a detached bungalow. To describe the proposed request as a "loft conversion" is misleading and could be described as somewhat "strategic". The existing pitched roof structure will be replaced by a flat roof and the existing roof skyline will be replaced by a square cube like structure extending out at all sides. By removing the sloping pitch and building upwards through the introduction of straight walls to all sides, the original building no longer bears any correlation to the existing structure - it is effectively replaced. Therefore, we feel that this is not an extension and should not be treated as such for the purpose of planning approval.

2. Loss of privacy and overlooking - detrimental impact upon the privacy of Watersedge, Florida Road, Ferring and the properties adjacent to the proposed development

The developer is seeking approval to effectively rebuild the current dwelling. This means adding an additional floor to a property which is currently a bungalow with no current habitable living space in the loft to become a two-story property with five upper floor windows facing out to the front of the property. These windows, because of their positioning as per the "proposed front view", will overlook our property and provide for a view directly into our property, therefore removing our privacy in the following rooms;

- Upper floor bedroom / front and side view windows;

- Ground floor bedroom;
- Ground floor lounge;
- Ground floor conservatory;
- Outside space where our outdoor dining and seating areas exist.

Currently, no windows at the property that can see into our property or garden, therefore privacy is maintained and has been since the properties were built in the 1930's. Additionally, another proposed window to the west elevation will directly overlook our garden. Furthermore, the proposed addition of a glass balcony to the rear elevation will enable us to be completely overlooked. This is due to the design of the property and because of the addition of an extra floor - and position of the development. Currently, no windows exist that overlook our garden; therefore, privacy that has existed for almost a century will be lost.

The planning application appears also to be in conflict with the Adoption Arun District Councils Local Plan 2011 – 2031, Policy aims detailed below;

Adoption Arun Local Plan, 13.4.3 Extensions and alterations to existing buildings should be designed to:

- *Complement the scale and massing of the existing building; Preserve any features of interest;*
- *Provide a satisfactory relationship between old and new fabric;*
- ***Not lead to overlooking, overpowering, or overshadowing of neighbouring properties; and***
- ***Ensure adequate natural light within the building, garden, and amenity space.***

Policy D DM4 6.8: A, B, C,

A. the extension or alteration sympathetically relates to and is visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, massing, design, form, scale, and materials;

B. the extension or alteration is visually subservient to the main building and provide a high standard of amenity;

C. the extension or alteration does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties;

This proposal does not demonstrate that through its scale, density, layout, siting, character, and appearance, it has been designed to respect our property and its surroundings or in line with planning guidelines. The proposed development is at such an angle that the primary amenity area of our house and garden would be severely overlooked from the top rooms of the new development, resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy. The design of the proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for us as occupants of Watersedge or of adjacent residential properties, particularly with regard to our right to the quiet & private enjoyment of our garden amenities.

We would ask you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the **Human Rights Act** in particular **Protocol 1, Article 1** which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes the home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact on us and our right to the quiet & private enjoyment of our property. **Article 8** of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life.

3. Impact of the Design, Appearance, and layout of the proposed planning application

We believe that the proposed development does not respect local context and street pattern or, in

particular, the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings, and would be entirely out of the character of the area, to the detriment of the local environment. The properties facing out to Patterson's Walk where our properties are situated, are typically characterised by large gardens with large spacing between each detached plot with minimal shadowing / overlooking because of where in the plot, the properties were originally built. The developers proposed plan will engulf the width of garden space and create an overbearing effect for the properties to the east and west of its site (including our property Watersedge to the west) and moreover, the proposed extension by reason of its size and siting represents an un-neighbourly form of development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, including number 5, Florida Close, by reason of an "overbearing" effect / proximity to their property.

The developer is proposing to totally rebuild the property, which until he purchased it recently in 2021, had a floor plan that already included four bedrooms on the ground floor. The application as a set of plans does not show the true impact of the addition of an extra floor. The proposed dwelling design is unlike any other neighbouring property in terms of its proximity to other houses and its design. It will be entirely out of keeping with the properties in Florida Close and from the seafront vista.

Finally, the plans submitted do not show the distance from our boundary wall where the corner of the proposed study meets our property boundary. This is important because;

1. Managing noise / this area is our main paved garden seating area. We can already hear detailed conversations that take place from the developer from the current layout of the property. To bring this closer to our boundary increases noise and brings with it a further invasion of our privacy;
2. We have a downstairs bedroom situated close to where the garage is currently situated. To convert this to living space would introduce noise at a higher level than currently which we believe is unacceptable.
3. At a later stage during the build, the developer will ask for permission to use the ground floor extension as a terrace, serving the proposed upper floor. The plans show what appears to be full glass from the front north west view. This design elements introduces concerns from us re further privacy concerns.

4. Proposed positioning of the Garage

The developer's application includes approval to re-site the existing garage. We are strongly opposed to this for the following reasons;

1. The proposed siting is less than ½ metre from our boundary and would include building a wall facing a current window that has been in place for 21+ years. This will remove our source of natural light and allow **no natural light into the room**. We would welcome a visit from the planning officer to illustrate this first - hand.
2. The siting of the proposed garage will remove our access to be able to maintain our existing telephone line – as the cabling runs into our house from the east wall of our property;
3. Critically, the main water supply to our house is fed by a pipe which runs from the developer's property straight to ours under where the proposed site of the garage will be built. This is the reason that the current garage is situated where it is and has been since the property was

built. Hence any development along where this pipe is situated will cause significant problem should we require access to maintain or repair our water supply to our house. The water meter is situated directly outside the road at the entrance to the proposed development site.

4. We are concerned about the impact to our foundations if works are carried out so close to our existing property

The proposed garage should;

1. be relocated away at least 2 metres from the boundary to enable us to maintain and make repairs to our property and enjoy natural light *and*
2. the developer re-routes any water pipes that feed our property to a place where they would be easily accessible to maintain and repair.

Once again, we would welcome a visit from the planning officer to illustrate both of these issues at first hand.

5. Non-compliance with Government guidance

Government Planning Policy Statement PPS3: Housing, Paragraphs 13-14: Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted. LPAs should encourage development that creates places, streets and spaces which meet the needs of people, are visually attractive, safe, accessible, functional, inclusive, have their own distinctive identity and maintain and improve local character.

We believe the proposal to contravene this guidance as it is to the detriment of the character, and amenity value of the area, as outlined in the points above.

In conclusion we would also like to request that the council does not approve this application and that the developer should consider his application for resubmission against the backdrop of these and other comments, including those raised by Ferring Council, the Conservation society and other neighbours who have also expressed their concerns.

Due to concerns from the residents, the council should consider using its powers to enforce controlled hours of operation and other restrictions that might make the duration of any approved works more bearable. The proposed site of development is very small and contained and with the buildings so close to their neighbouring buildings, so we would ask that consideration be made about how and when construction takes place, (no weekend working for example) vehicles would gain access to the site for unloading and parking without causing a highway hazard or inconveniencing neighbours and noise management.

We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this application. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our home.

Sincerely,

Mark Stacey & Frankie Webster

