

Sent: 28 May 2015 22:13

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application: K14/15/HH: Broadbeach, 39 Coastal Road, BN16 1SN

Dear Mr.Leal -

We have noted the applicants' response dated 25th May to the objections raised to the above application, and the claim that there are some "*inaccuracies*" made in these objections including our own. We would like to clarify that we have only been able to comment on the written plans as they have been submitted because Mr and Mrs Mills have not at any point discussed their plans with us or, apparently, other neighbours. Clearly, it would have been beneficial all round had they chosen to do so and would have avoided the need for statements in the response such as "*the sketches do not show the neighbouring properties to scale...*" or "*the block plans do not represent a true picture...*". Statements like this lead us to question whether there are other ambiguities in the written submission which we haven't yet spotted.

As some of the "inaccuracies" are purported to have originated from us, we would like to provide our perspective on these:

- Our statement that the new extension which is directly against our adjoining wall "*would protrude 1.5 metres above the adjoining wall*" has been described as "*incorrect*". We calculated this from the measurements shown in the architect's drawings and showed the calculation in our objection but there is no explanation as to why this is wrong. However, the key point is that the architect's drawings show that there will be a considerable protrusion above this wall and we have not received an adequate response to this concern. Instead, there is a confusing statement about "*an adjoining false tiled pitched roof on the side of Nr 41*". To clarify: this is decoration along the top of our wall, it does not protrude above the dividing wall, and the nearest point of our property is 10 feet from that dividing wall in line with common practice along Coastal Road and the covenants on our property.
- The response gives examples of other 3 storey houses along Coastal Road. The key point, which is not stated, is that all of these houses have been properly positioned in their plots and have adequate space at the sides to distance themselves from neighbouring properties, which is not the case for these plans.
- There is a statement that "*the gap [between Broadbeach and neighbouring properties] is unaltered at first floor level and above, which is consistent with good design and planning practice*" and this point is repeated later in the response. This seems irrelevant because none of the 65 properties along Coastal Road has a first floor or above which is directly up against the boundary of a neighbouring property. Our concern isn't that at all: it concerns

the proposal to build wall-to-wall across the width of the plot at ground floor level when only 2 properties on Coastal Road have done this (i.e. 97% of properties have not) and these 2 properties have placed garages at either side of their plot and not living accommodation. As stated in our objection, we do not understand why it is felt to be reasonable to put living accommodation directly up against the wall of a neighbouring property when no other house in the road has done this (and we have walked the length of the road to validate this point).

- The response also makes references to other properties on Coastal Road which are “*considerably larger and more imposing*” when justifying the scale of the proposed development. We feel obliged to point out that plot sizes on Coastal Road vary considerably, with Broadbeach having one of the smaller plot widths on the sea side of the road, and that the significant majority of houses have been positioned properly within their plots.

Finally, we have noted the comments around quality of build and style of architecture, and agree that the properties at the end of Coastal Road are fine examples of modern architecture. These properties have been built in proportion to the size of their plots with adequate separation from neighbouring properties, which we consider to be the relevant point for comparison between these properties and the plans under consideration.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Regards,

Mr and Mrs G Palmer, 41 Coastal Road.