

30th March 2022

Kingston Parish Council
33 The Ridings,
East Preston
West Sussex
BN16

Dear Ms Tomalova,

Re: Consultation response to Application K/11/22/PL

Thank you for your consultation letter regarding the application for the neighbouring property at 37 Coastal Road. Whilst we have no objection to the principle of a re-build we **do object** to certain features of the application which would impact on our amenity and privacy. These are identified below.

Privacy

There are a number of concerns around the impact on our privacy from the submitted proposals.

Policy D DM4(c) states that *the extension or alteration does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties*. We believe that the plans as presented overlook our property in two areas:

The first is to the first-floor balcony. We believe that a privacy screen should be included to both end of the long balcony to avoid overlooking into our property and gardens terrace immediately outside our rear doors. This was a requirement of our application (K/14/19/HH) which sets a clear precedent for such features.

The second is the roof terrace. In our application (K/14/19/HH) the Parish Council sought to require that no access to roof space should be allowed except for maintenance which was a condition of our consent and is another relevant precedent established in planning.

We believe that in allowing access to the roof space impacts on the privacy of our home. Policy D DM1(15) states that development should comply with Arun District Council Design Guide. We refer you to Design Guide policies J.02 Scale and Massing (Privacy Measures) – that requires separation distances between habitable rooms of 21m. We also refer you to Policy H.04 of the Arun Design Guid. The minimum balcony distances between properties should be 17m.

We believe that the rooftop balconies are within this distance (we are not clear on this issue and request that the applicant clarifies this through drawn evidence) and would require a tall privacy screen of a minimum 1.7m with the same condition to the neighbouring property at 41 Coastal Road (so as to enable the future redevelopment of this home). With such a screen on both sides the character of the house and its skyline would be compromised, leading to an incongruous elevation, unacceptable to the street scene.

We therefore believe that the roof terrace be removed from the application.

Massing

Following on from the previous point around the likely need to provide privacy screens to the roof terrace, the proposed roof plan as shown on P232-108 shows access to a roof terrace which is essentially giving access to the existing ridge line of the current house. This does not seem to be in keeping with Local Plan Policy D DM1(14) and Neighbourhood Plan policy KPNP-7 in terms of keeping a visual line. As can be seen on P232-110 this allows number 37 to be several metres above our second-floor terrace.

Additionally, whilst the proposed plans show that in footprint and elevation there is little variation to the existing house, in fact the massing of the property is far larger given the flat roof at the same ridgeline providing a much larger volume. A roof terrace would further increase the massing of the property from the street. We therefore object to the provision of a roof terrace on these grounds.

We also believe that the proposals fall within the 25-, 45- and 60-degree rules identified in the Arun Design Guide Policy G.03 however given the southern aspect of our property we do not object to the design on this ground.

Amenity

Whilst the above objections relate to overlooking the roof terrace and its impact on massing, it will also impact on the amenity of our property and the other neighbours at number 41.

Under KPNP-7 item (iv) this will cause our property significant overlooking issues and loss of privacy as has been outlined by number 41. We also notice number 37 is installing a bar as part of their property, we consider drinking and anti-social behaviour could occur at this rooftop terrace. We refer you to Local Plan policy D DM1(3) around impact on neighbours and avoiding unacceptable noise and disturbance. We also refer to the Human Rights Act, article 8 (right to respect private and family life). The roof terrace, given its proposed use will likely unreasonably interfere with our private amenity. Given that the proposals greatly exceed the standards for outside space and with the proposals already benefitting from the enjoyment of a large first floor terrace we believe the roof terrace is an unnecessary addition that would impact the street and neighbours and should therefore be removed.

On drawings P232-105 - the siting of the swimming pool and plant room on the western side of the plot means that we will continue to experience issues associated with KPNP-7 item (iv), particularly around noise from the plant room. The eastern edge of number 37 is a public footpath, and it makes far more sense to swap the plant room and the pool to this side of the plot. The neighbours at number 35 on the other side of the footpath have done this by siting their pool to their western boundary, thus limiting their affect on their neighbours.

Inaccuracy of submitted information

Whilst it is commendable that the development is looking to be more sustainable and environmentally conscious, we have an issue with the 16 PV panels shown on the roof. These look at least 2m x 1m long and typically have to be at an angle of between 35-60 degrees for maximum effect.

The proposed elevations shown on the drawings P232-110, 109 and 104 do not show these panels on the elevations and the parapets are not deep enough to screen them. The Kingston Parish Neighbourhood Plan, KPNP-7 Design & Development item (viii) suggests that solar panels should sympathetically relate to and be visually integrated, however we will be able to see them from our second-floor terrace as will everyone else from the beach. We also question why this building needs an air conditioning plant on the roof as

if it is meant to be environmentally friendly, this plant will be noisy and environmentally unfriendly, and if it is to be maintained then it should be appropriately visually and acoustically screened which, like a point raised above would be incongruous to the form of the house. Instead, the use of the relocated pool plant room should be explored for the purposes of air conditioning.

In conclusion, we do not object to the general form of the proposals however believe that the use of the roof be reconsidered, replaced by properly integrated solar panels. In conclusion our main points are:

1. The first-floor balcony should be properly screened from both sides
2. The roof terrace should be removed due to privacy, amenity and subsequent visual impact grounds
3. The solar panels, and AC plant should be better sited, integrated and screened
4. The swimming pool and associated plant room should be better sited to the footpath side of the property.

Yours sincerely

Mark Holmes
Broadbeach
39 Coastal Road
East Preston
BN16 1SN