



54 East Front Road

Pagham

Bognor Regis

PO21 4ST

December 5 2011

Director of Planning Services

Arun District Council

Maltravers Road

Littlehampton BN17 5LF

Dear Director,

Re: Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Application ref P/87/11/ - 52 East Front Road Pagham -
Re-submission following application ref:P/47/11

ACK

We write in objection to this recent application for permission to revise the proposed additions to an existing permitted development on our West flank boundary, adjacent to our home of the past 27 years. I refer to Arun District Local Area Plan Policy Gen 7- Area of special character and Development Criteria for East Front Road Pagham.

We have had sight of the plans and wish to object to the proposal on the following grounds:

East boundary line of No 52

- i) on the east side of no 52 East Front Road you have already granted permission for an extension to be built. This allows the extension to project right to the boundary of our property. This alone will severely restrict the drainage capability along the East flank. This problem is compounded by the fact that you have also granted permission for an extension to the south of the property which removes any chance of drainage towards the west of the property. The only drainage possible after construction will therefore be into and through our property which is a wholly unsatisfactory state of affairs and frankly is totally unacceptable. When the sea over-tops again like it did in recent years, these permitted extensions will act as dams and actually prevent drainage of excess water. This is contrary to Arun Development Criteria which states "Avoid elements which might inhibit free drainage within identified flood risk zone".

Undercroft

- ii) The proposer is now attempting to expand by stealth, adding extra elements i.e. an undercroft - they call it an "undercroft" which, when included as part of the complete submission P47/11, failed to gain consent. The word "undercroft" is a misleading euphemism for "large subterranean crypt". I feel it may one day prove aptly named if the children are down there when there is heavy rain or overtopping of the sea as mentioned above. In any event it will fill with water which makes it a danger to curious children or pets. We object to any such preposterous innovation right on our boundary. The danger to our structure in constructing such a fiasco is nothing compared to the

destruction and disruption to flora and fauna and indeed to the integrity of the beach mass itself.

- iii) We urge the planning committee to insist there is a service gap between the boundary and our property. At present the entire scheme is un neighbourly as the buildings proposed are too close, prevent drainage on the proposer's own land and diverts all his drainage across our boundary. His solution is simple. He must leave, as we have done, clear channels around his property as we have done around ours to clear flood waters in the certain knowledge that we need to prepare now for an overtopping event. It is also inexplicable that the permission given to build the new property at number 56 - the East Side of us - was conditional upon leaving a gap of 1660mm from the East of our fence (the East boundary of our property to the new West wall of the new building at 56 planning ref /11. We object to number 52 being allowed to build to the boundary on our west as there will be an increased fire risk to our property and a significant overbearing and over shadowing of our west elevation unless there is a condition applied making a similar distance from the boundary as is the case with the neighbour on the other side. How strange that different rules seem to apply to different sides of our building. Has there been an error?

- iv) We have not built to the boundary but have left a drainage channel all around our property and clear paths down East and West flanks to facilitate our emergency drainage. We have never yet been flooded. Over topping at Pagham beach was last witnessed by me and others about four years ago when seawater at high tide ran down beside Pagham yacht club and into Beach Road at the junction with East Front Road

P 123/10

creating a significant pond along beach road/ East front road junction. I have shared my concerns with Mr. Ray Radmall Pagham pc Chairman, of over-topping by exceptional wave and weather circumstances.

My wife and I do not agree to accept flood water from no 52 to escape via no 54 East Front Road. The proposer must make provision to deal with his own flood water on his own property..

The Underground room has by "stealth" found its way back to this application. Our objections on this matter are many. Collateral damage caused by an excavation of gargantuan magnitude is unavoidable to our structure which has remained intact since 1923 - coming up to its centenary year soon. Excavation and piling (ramming sheet metal to a depth of 5 metres (16ft 5" at least) for foundations The beach disruption would cause enormous devastation to the flora and fauna that form the ecology of this last wild and natural environment and shows callous contempt for all our local efforts over many years to protect and nurture this microcosm.

- v) The underground room will not be used in the summer months as a boat store as the access to get boats in and out would be far too troublesome for daily use. The proposer has many guests both adult and children many of whom visit from other countries often staying several days and nights. They clearly need more accommodation. Mr Evers has himself told us when we were discussing his project that he was including a "rumpus room" for not only his children but the many other children who frequent the property at various times. It is of considerable concern that if the

opportunity for habitation is present then sooner or later that is what will happen. That is dangerous where you have a probability, however infrequently, of inundation from the sea. On whose conscience will a fatality lie?

- vi) The construction of a two storey property will be created and that is a wholly unwelcome precedent in contravention of the established development criteria for this unique beach estate and will literally open the floodgates to a multitude of highly devious applications which will change the entire character of our beach estate.

Vii) Loss of sunshine to our West side : increased fire risk

The owners propose to build ON THE BOUNDARY which is 166cm from our toilet/bathroom and bedroom on the west side of our property. This is too close for decent privacy and comfort. At the moment they too have a 160cm wide approx pathway at the side of their property leaving a total space between opposite windows of only 333cm. This hitherto mandatory distance has proved acceptable for all in the years since the properties were built in 1920-1925. It will be reduced to 160cm i.e. only 5ft 5inches in total at the widest part reducing to a gap of only 5ft 3" between opposing buildings (except where the extension projects to the boundary).

- ✓ (ii) The proposed construction (no construction details are available to us) has been mooted as timber frame and timber clad. The issue of fire hazard is, therefore, of great concern - especially if the permitted fire break is reduced to 166cm. Please remember that the prevailing Westerly/North Westerly winds puts us 1st in line if the proposed extension catches fire. We will be just 5ft5 inches to the East which is unacceptable to us - the breezes here on the beach are much stronger than elsewhere locally and the area of SSSI land just to the north side of East Front Road is often set fire by visiting children - the most recent example being November 5th this year when the fire Brigade had to attend a local emergency. Also, the existing roof material of no.52 is mineral felt, itself being potentially flammable from flying sparks and especially FIREWORKS and BARBECUES both of which the proposers are frequent participants in. Cladding of the proposed extension in timber will require a fireproof paint finish to the exterior of the East flank of the building, which is going to be visually unacceptable to us. Furthermore, we are in the process of fencing the boundary in our own choice and style of timber and colour. The proposers will be therefore unable to service and maintain any paint finish applied to the East flank of their buildings (unless they are built away from the boundary).

The bulk of the proposal right on the boundary effectively eliminates our view to the west with its trees and hedgerow down to Pagham parade and all the SSSI to the west of us, in breach of Policy Gen.7v and Gen7vi). We will be staring at a blank wall towering above our own fence and obscuring a large

part of the evening sunshine, which we have enjoyed for the last 27 years since buying our bungalow. The proposer assured us he would keep the height to an absolute minimum. We feel he has reneged on this assurance as he has on others. We are suspicious that the proposed design readily allows for another storey to be build atop of this present proposal using the "verandah" as the ideal site to place the staircase to a 2nd floor. The overall area of the ground plan would become too large for the plot according to guidelines of 40%.

- ii) Boiler emissions will be ejected straight into our property and garden where our grandchildren play and my wife and I intend to relax and enjoy our approaching retirement. If the breeze is offshore the boiler emissions will come along the new reduced width path and into my bedroom window on the front west carriage or into the front west corner window into our lounge.

This is totally unacceptable and the boiler needs to be sited on an external north or west wall to vent either to the North or West like other properties in this vicinity. We all have right to clean air and sunlight.

Building on the shared boundary

- iii) Rainwater gutters and downpipes. None are shown on the plans but no overhang of our vertical boundary of any part of the building or finishes would be acceptable.
- iv) Part of the proposal involves a party wall. No approach has been made to us regarding the necessary handling of this legal matter. Until such legal matters have been notified we cannot agree to any activity

which will impinge on our boundary. This project would fall under the Party Wall Act 1996.

- v) Building to the boundary will effectively prevent us from maintenance to the west side window (now over boarded) and west wall of our garage. Although a small distance from the boundary was achieved - in those days nobody living down here would ever build to the boundary and it was always implicit that it was the norm to leave access within all properties for occasional maintenance. Again the fire risk is worrying - the proposer seeking permission to put a new wooden framed and clad building just 30cm from our Garage in which we have a vehicle, wood, caravan gas bottle, paint, solvent, outboard motor and fuel tank, spare fuel etc.

vi) Recent Planning Refusal

Your planning committee has just refused permission for an extension reference application no. P/47/11 at this address, with an identical footprint. It would be inconsistent to now allow this earlier application to succeed. I would also add that the planning notice system failed to work for us on the occasion of the original application. We never saw an orange notice posted anywhere. We went on holiday in July 2008 and returned in early September to find that, without notice or prior discussion with us, our neighbour had applied and got permission to build this overbearing and overshadowing construction which would eliminate late afternoon sunshine from the west in our small garden and cast a large shadow down our western boundary in contravention of Gen7 iv). Our "neighbour" did not have the decency to say he had applied for planning permission but led us to believe it was at a "concept" stage. The planning procedure needs to actively notify neighbours when large overbearing structures are proposed in close proximity to existing, treasured historic buildings.

Please also note that on the current application all the existing structures not attached to the main bungalow are drawn and labelled as "boathouse", "store" and "bedroom 3" but are wooden garden sheds and never had any planning permission.

As they are "temporary structures" it is misleading of the proposer to claim he is replacing existing sub-standard "buildings". None of these sheds have been used as accommodation by the previous owner, apart from emergency overnight stays by the eldest son and his new wife by agreement from us with our existing neighbours. They then vacated and now live in the West Country. This large shed has not been used as accommodation for more than 7 years.

The proposer and his family have a large house in London and they do not intend to live in Pagham. They come occasionally at weekends by private car (Gen7 iii) and often disappear again sailing on their yacht kept in Chichester marina. No.52 East Front Rd. is therefore only a dormitory, not a home.

I believe the "extra accommodation" afforded by this extension will be used by the many guests who appear frequently. There is, however, parking provision only for one motor car and therefore parking in the narrow unmade beach road is going to become a consequence of this development contrary to Gen 7viii). Our garage access is immediately adjacent to the proposed site and we have experienced some difficulty on occasions with visitors to no 52 parking carelessly in the road and obstructing the exit/entrance to our garage. Our house, no 54 has been our only home for 27 years and we are 63 years of age and have known and loved Pagham for all our lives. Please do not allow this over-development : for this precedent will encourage other part time residents to follow suit. East Front Road will become millionaire's row like Sandbanks in Poole Harbour for summer convenience only.

Yours faithfully

Margaret J Holland

John A. Holland



5.12.11

5/12/11