

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter **[here](#)**



From: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 February 2021 12:44
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning Application LU-349-20 - 32&33 Mariners Quay - Advice please

Andrew Wood MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department



T: 01903 737768
E: andrew.wood@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter **[here](#)**



From: Peter Matthey [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 February 2021 16:50
To: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application LU-349-20 - 32&33 Mariners Quay - Advice please

Dear Mr Woods,

I have tried phoning you on several occasions to discuss the process and the timing of the decision making process for our applications but have not managed to make contact. I have spoken at length to our Ward Councillor, Ian Buckland, who has recommended that I email you.

We are very concerned about the objections that have been submitted for our application which appear to have originated from a small group who have obviously convinced a significant number of their friends from around the town (and the country!) to object to our application. From some of the comments made, we suspect that these objectors may not have even looked at what the application proposes! There are comments about the proposal giving rise to balcony based parties and barbeques when all we want to do is to extend by a mere 1.07m (42 inches) so we have room for a table on the balcony to eat off.

There are also comments made about the proposal spoiling the regularity of the rear elevation. Were our houses to be a block of flats or even a uniform terrace, then I would agree. But the architect for Mariners Quay went to great lengths to ensure that the properties, which are designed in pairs, are all quite distinct with differing roof designs (gables, semi-dormers and simple flat roofs), differing materials (some rendered, some brick, some ship-lapped) and with different styles of balconies (some white metal with glass and other dark wood with slats). The existing balcony separators are quite different (some glass, some wood) and even the ridge heights are different. However, for our proposal we have been at great lengths to preserve the look of our houses and are proposing to re-use the existing balcony rails to ensure there is not change of materials or design. To the casual observer, the frontage will look exactly the same except that the balcony rails will be aligned with our neighbour.



Differing architectural styles gives variety and interest

Comments have been made about the staggered design cleverly avoiding overlooking. The reason the houses are staggered is so that the architect could keep the houses close to the river to maximise the space so that other flats and houses to be built facing River Road as the plot widened. Far from preventing overlooking, this exaggerates overlooking. For example, our existing balcony is overlooked by our neighbour who, if they stand at the front of their balcony can also look straight onto our balcony and into our lounge. However, we do not find this to be a problem.



Existing overlooking between 31 and 32

The other issue raised is the loss of light to the downstairs rooms in the neighbouring properties. Again we feel that this greatly exaggerated. Given the soft vegetation and paraphernalia in the rear gardens it is likely that the 1.07m extension will not even be visible to the downstairs windows in the neighbouring properties, far less reducing light. Even if it were to be true we do not believe that this is a material planning consideration.



Back garden between 33 and 34

We would like the opportunity to put some of these points over and counteract the numerous exaggerate and inaccurate comments that have been made.

What I would welcome is your advice on when we should make these comments. Do I need to write to you with a full list of our concerns about the objections that have been submitted prior to you preparing your recommendations on the application, or should I wait until the agenda for the Development Control meeting is published? Is it possible that you may make a delegated decision without the application ever going to committee in which case we would miss the opportunity to comment?

Finally, several of the objections have commented on the potential for views to be obscured by our proposed balcony separators. We had included these separators because we thought that overlooking carried more weight in planning terms than loss of views. However, we would be more than willing to remove the proposal for any additional inter-balcony screens, thereby totally eliminating any objections citing a loss of view. As you can see from the picture above, not having an inter-balcony separator would not make the overlooking any worse than it is now. I would welcome your thoughts on this and if you believe that it would improve the application, I can easily amend the relevant drawing.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Peter Matthey
32 Mariners Quay