

Mr and Mrs Baritsch
1 Elmer Court
Elmer Sands
West Sussex PO22 6JT



Mr A Wood
Planning and Development Services
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex BN17 5LF

via email: andrew.wood@arun.gov.uk

12th August 2017

Dear Mr Wood

Replace two storey rear extension & erection of rear balcony & external staircase. 2 Elmer Court Middleton on Sea

Ref M/62/17/HH - Mr A Wood and Mr N Crowther

We write in connection with the above planning application for a Replacement of the two storey rear extension & erection of rear balcony & external staircase at 2 Elmer Court. We have examined the online plans and documentation and looked for similar projects in the area. We know the site well as we are the neighbours on the Western side.

As a result we do not view the proposed balcony as being appropriate.

As the building plans are not clear about the exact dimensions of the proposed development it is difficult to assess the full extent of the proposed development.

Overbearing nature of the development

We assume the balcony will extend an additional 2.4 metres beyond the current extension, it would mean that the proposed development is 5.5m meters in total from the main house (2 Elmer Court without the current extension). The size of the extension including the proposed balcony is overbearing for the area it is in.

Looking further afield in the area we have not seen any other seafacing properties that have a similarly large balcony added in front of an already existing extension.

As the two buildings (1 Elmer Court and 2 Elmer Court) are very close together, the extension with the balcony would effectively mean we would have a long high wall of about 4.5 metres in height (over two levels) at a length of about 5.5m, ie stretching along a third of our garden. This will impinge significantly on our privacy and the ability to enjoy our garden. We tried to demonstrate this effect in an attached drawing (Appendix 1 - Proposed new Extension with balcony).

We would also like to point out that according to the floorplan the walls of replacement extension will be moved closer to our boundary, further increasing the above effect.

We note that it is common practice to put in privacy glass to protect neighbours properties. We suggest that in this instance such privacy glass on the side of the balcony will worsen the overbearing nature of the proposal. (An example is the extension of 4 The Hard, the other side of our property with even a staircase on the boundary.)

Impingement on our privacy / enjoyment of our garden and property

The extent to which the existing building windows already overlook our property and garden from the top floor and ground floor can be seen on the attached pictures (Appendix 2 - View from our Easterly Bedroom and Appendix 3 - View from our garden (patio) towards the current extension). The infringement into our privacy will increase due to the large size of the proposed window on the top floor. Privacy glass on the first floor window would be essential to avoid looking directly into our bedroom.

The erection of the balcony at the proposed height would mean that our whole garden can be overlooked from 2 Elmer Court despite installing privacy glass on the Western side. This will significantly impinge on our privacy.

We understand that this concern is also raised by Middleton Parish Council, (Mr J Lake).

We note that the balcony will also significantly restrict our Eastern sea views.

In addition to the above we would like to draw your attention to the following points:

Character of the area

The majority of houses around 2 Elmer court are smaller houses with gardens facing the sea. 2 Elmer Court is already one of the bigger houses. The erection of the balcony would make look 2 Elmer Court much bigger and its overbearing nature will no longer fit in the area. Moreover there are no other houses in the area that have a balcony added to an extension to an existing house. (We found many houses with a ground floor extension and a balcony on the first floor.)

Party wall agreement

We assume from the floorplan that the rebuild of the extension includes moving the

wall of the extension closer to our property to align with the wall of the main building wall. This would mean the new extension will be bigger than the existing footprint by at least two length of bricks. As a result we assume new foundations will be required which in turn would require a party wall agreement for the works to proceed. If the extension were to be approved we would expect to receive a party wall notice.

Rain water

We understand that the proposed balcony will cover a surface area of about 25square meters. We suggest that this would have an impact from a soaking point of view, particular if combined with the additional footprint, as natural soaking will be reduced. As a result we do not think that the requirement for local validation should be waived.

Y ours faithfully

Mr and Mrs Baritsch

Appendix 1 - Proposed new E xtension with balcony



Appendix 2 - View from our Easterly Bedroom



Appendix 3 - View from our garden (patio) towards the current extension

