

Lynnyrd Wolfe

From: Maria Tomalova
Sent: 19 June 2019 10:05
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens
Attachments: Prop Park Elevation 2.pdf; Prop Plot Plan 125 2.pdf; Prop Street Elevation 1.pdf; Garage Detail Unit 2.pdf; Prop Elevations Unit 2 Rev C.pdf

Importance: High

Please see an action sheet.

From: Tim Rodway | Rodway Planning | [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 June 2019 13:19
To: Maria Tomalova
Cc: Juan Baeza
Subject: RE: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens
Importance: High

Dear Maria

I refer to our previous correspondence from last month.

Having considered your comments in respect of the application proposals, the scheme's Architect has prepared the attached revised drawings. I would be grateful if you could please take a look at these updated drawings, and let me know if you have any queries as soon as possible.

In summary, and in line with your advice, Unit 2 has been reduced to a single storey dwelling. Unit 2's garage has been repositioned, in line with your recommendations. We can advise that the gross internal floor area of the new bungalow is 84 m2, which comfortably meets the National Space Standards requirement for a 3-bed single storey dwelling.

Provided that you are now satisfied with the revised drawings now presented, we would be grateful if you could attach these drawings to the Application File and supersede those versions originally submitted. If re-consultation and re-advertisement is required, we would be grateful if you could progress this as soon as possible.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

TIM RODWAY
[REDACTED]



RODWAY PLANNING
CONSULTANCY LIMITED

[REDACTED]

From: Maria Tomalova [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 May 2019 15:25
To: Tim Rodway | [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens

Dear Tim,

Thank you for your email; enjoy your holiday.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Maria

From: Tim Rodway | Rodway Planning [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 May 2019 14:36
To: Maria Tomalova
Subject: RE: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens

Dear Maria

Further to our previous discussions and emails, I have now had the opportunity to liaise with the applicant in respect of the suggested revisions, and he is now instructing his architect to revisit the plans to see how your ideas can be accommodated.


Please note, I am on holiday from this weekend until 29 May, so it maybe a week or two before we can forward to the revised drawings.

I trust that this is satisfactory.

Best regards,



RODWAY PLANNING
CONSULTANCY LIMITED



From: Maria Tomalova [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 May 2019 09:11
To: Tim Rodway | Rodway Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens

Dear Tim,

Thank you for your prompt response.

I hope we will bring it to the satisfying end .

I look forward of hearing from you.

Kind regards

Maria

From: Tim Rodway | Rodway Planning [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 May 2019 21:03
To: Maria Tomalova
Subject: RE: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens

Dear Maria

Further to your email following our earlier telephone discussion, I can confirm that I will now liaise with the applicant and then come back to you with a response.

Best regards,

TIM RODWAY
[REDACTED]



From: Maria Tomalova [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 May 2019 12:47
To: Tim Rodway | Rodway Planning [REDACTED]
Subject: FP/274/18/PL, 10 Felpham Gardens

Dear Mr Rodway,

With reference to our recent phone conversation please find below some suggestion for an amendment of your proposal:

- Lower the ridge of the roof; one level in this particular case would be desirable
- Unit 1 is proposed aligned with the existing house No 8 Felpham Gardens as such it would not affect substantially the residential amenity of this property.
- However the proposed Unit 2 of the same shape and scale as Unit 1 would be obscuring the outlook from the rear of No 8 and would be an overbearing structure

(12.5m deep, 6.7m high), entirely closing the view to the south and within the winter time when the sun is low, from the sun-light.

Suggestion: proposed Unit 2 should be reduced considerably (the height in the between of the proposed Unit 1 and an existing bungalows to the east) to be

acceptable without affecting the amenity and prospect of inhabitants of No8

Probably you can reduce the width of Unit 2 by re-positioning the garage where the cycle storage is proposed with a direct access to it.

Your strategy with cleaning the site from the trees before applying for the planning permission has raised some objections and disapprovals.

Please let me know (after consultation with your client) if you can address the issues above.

Kind regards

Maria

Maria Tomalova
Senior Planning Officer