

Dear Ms Willard

22nd October 2018

Re: FP/207/18/HH

Single and two storey rear extension along with new dormer roof window

29 Roundle Avenue, Felpham PO22 8LL

We refer to the above Planning Application and are writing to register our Objection to the proposed development. We are the neighbouring bungalow to the north-east side, no. 31.

THE PROPOSAL WOULD CAUSE SIGNIFICANT HARM TO OUR RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AT NO. 31

The proposed plan changes the current hipped end which is next to our property to a gable end. Also there are two dormer windows being added to the roof at the rear of the property. These are very large, starting just below the roof ridge and protrude so the front is almost flush with the existing rear elevation. The extensive width of these dormer windows means that the one closest to us will start only slightly in from the new gable end wall.

Our property is set 2.3 metres further forward to the south- east and there is only a distance of 1.8 metres between the wall of no. 29 and the wall of our property. Our main objection is that in view of this the first floor extension would be overbearing from our point of view and there would be loss of outlook and also loss of light.

The current gap created by the hipped end at number 29 would be lost and this together with the large dormer window would have an oppressive impact. It would reduce the enjoyment of our rear garden, looming large over our patio and create a sense of enclosure in view of its height, depth and bulk resulting in a serious loss of outlook.

The change from the current hipped end to a gable end together with the large dormer window would also restrict light into our property. This includes our kitchen which is at the rear of our property and also a side window to our lounge, which whilst being secondary to a window at the front, gives valuable light after midday when the sun moves round. We also have a rooflight which provides valuable light in the rear of the bedroom on the south west side of our property which would be affected by the change of the hipped roof to a gable end.

As we are located to the north-east of number 29, we would also lose afternoon and evening sunlight in our garden as well as our kitchen.

We feel that the proposed development would not accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) because one of its core planning principles is to 'always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants' of land and buildings'. Our standard of amenity would be severely affected by the Application and we feel that the harm warrants refusal in this case.

THE OVERALL DESIGN APPROACH

The Government's Planning Practice Guidance note (PPG) on 'Design' confirms that the successful integration of all forms of new development with their surrounding context is an important design objective and that local building forms and details contribute to the distinctive qualities of a place. It states that distinctiveness is what often makes a place special and valued and relies on physical aspects such as the local pattern of plots, building forms, details and materials as well as style and vernacular.

Many properties in the area have been extended, however, with this proposal the increased volume at first floor level, with three bedrooms and two bathrooms being created in the roof space would appear disproportionate in comparison to the restrained use of the roof space in neighbouring properties. In particular:-

- The proposed development would result in two gable ends which is in contrast to all the other bungalows in the vicinity and also results in the loss of an important visual gap
- The proposal introduces a flat roof section on one side at the height of the current ridge which would be visible from the road and alien to the area
- The contrast with the surrounding roofs and the accumulation of the additions would exacerbate the proposal's harmful impact
- The major reconfiguration would be at odds with the existing pattern of development and the qualities which contribute to its local distinctiveness.

Other additions at roof level in this part of the Estate have not altered the original appearance so significantly as this proposal. The retention of the original hips and ridges has maintained the strong visual relationship between the buildings and contributes to the pleasant openness of the street scene. In our opinion the proposed changes at first floor level do not reflect or respect that local distinctiveness. Having a double gabled bungalow would be out of keeping and we feel the hipped end should be retained.

POLICY CONFLICTS

We feel that the proposed development of no. 29 conflicts with Policy Gen 7 of the Arun District Local Plan because it does not respond positively to the identified characteristics of the area and does not respect and enhance local distinctiveness. Also the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on us as adjoining occupiers at no. 31.

With regard to Policy Dev 19 of the Arun District Local Plan we feel that:-

- the proposal does not sympathetically relate to, and is not visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, design, form and scale;
- the proposal is not visually subservient to the main building
- the proposal would have an adverse overshadowing and overbearing effect of the neighbouring property (us at no. 31);
- the proposal compromises and disrupts the established special character and pattern of the street.

On a more local level we feel that the proposal is contrary to the Felpham Neighbourhood Plan, Policy ESD1 (design of new development) which highlights the importance of new developments being of a high quality design and contributing to local character by creating a sense of place appropriate to its location.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we feel that the proposed development would unduly harm our living conditions, as well as having an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of Roundle Avenue.

In our view, the amount of additional space which is being sought within the roof space at no. 29 is inappropriate for the bungalow, namely, three bedrooms and two bathrooms.

For the reasons stated above, we feel a refusal of this proposal is justified. Furthermore it would set a precedence in Roundle Avenue that would be harmful.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our Objections and we trust that you will be able to take all of them into account when assessing the Application.

Yours sincerely

Mr and Mrs G A Thomas