

**From:** Zac Denton  
**Sent:** 12 December 2018 08:29  
**To:** Planning.Responses  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application Ref: R/197/18/HH – 1 Pigeonhouse Lane (1PL) , Rustington

Objection to R/197/18/HH

Zachariah Denton | Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor , Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF  
Internal: 37447 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 Ext: 37447 | E-mail: [zac.denton@arun.gov.uk](mailto:zac.denton@arun.gov.uk)

Please note this information is given without prejudice and represents the informal view of the officer and not an official opinion of Arun District Council.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 December 2018 15:39  
**To:** Zac Denton  
**Subject:** Planning Application Ref: R/197/18/HH – 1 Pigeonhouse Lane (1PL) , Rustington

Dear Mr. Denton,

**Planning Application Ref: R/197/18/HH – 1 Pigeonhouse Lane (1PL) , Rustington**

Further to our telephone call earlier we are writing in response to the email from Peter Southgate (Agent to 1PL) to Juan Baeza dated 6 December 2018 which we were able to view on the ADC website over the weekend. The email contains inaccuracies and assertions which we believe should be corrected before you reach your decision. We will address them in the order of his email although we will try to restrict our comments to the principal issues.

Willowhayne Estate: David Charles' email to Peter Southgate dated 19 June 2018 states that consent is conditional on ADC's planning approval and subject to ADC's conditions and therefore this is not a substantive approval. The "design parameters" referred to relate to pre-existing restrictive covenants on 1PL of which the owners were aware prior to their purchase of 1PL in 2017. We did not refer to the covenants in our representation letter of 29 October 2018 as we were advised that this is a legal matter and not an ADC planning issue but we have been advised by our solicitors to reserve all our legal rights and remedies in this matter.

Proposed Designs: Please note that we have not had sight of SK1 and SK2.

What the Agent refers to as the "side south-facing windows" of 9 Cross Road (9CR) are in fact the windows for all the principal living areas of 9CR and to suggest that they are not impacted by the proposed extensions is utterly untrue. The measurements referred to in our letter of 29 October demonstrate that

given the very close proximity of 1PL directly to the south the proposed substantial increase in the roof height and “vertical extension” to the overall roof length would result in a very significant reduction to our natural daylight and sunlight, as well as causing overshadowing and an overhanging effect which would be seriously harmful to our living conditions.

The reference to the extension work at 9CR (which was undertaken by the previous owners of our property) as a precedent is completely irrelevant. The extension work did not deprive any neighbour of light nor cause an overshadowing effect given that neighbours to the north and east are a considerable distance from 9CR and 1PL being to the south had no overshadowing or light issues. Furthermore the work was carried out on the original footprint of 9CR and the main alterations to the property were to the rear and had little impact on street scene. No objections from neighbours or Rustington Parish Council were raised to 9CR’s planning application.

The Agent’s reference to photos submitted in the application as setting precedent is also irrelevant, as the spatial relationship of those properties to their neighbours is entirely different to the very close spatial relationship between 1PL and 9CR on the north/south boundary.

The proposals to alter the window closest to our property in the rear first floor extension would create direct overlooking into our south lounge window which is an unacceptable intrusion on our privacy.

Summary: The Agent’s repeated references to the precedent of 9CR’s planning application are irrelevant. The issues under consideration simply did not apply to its neighbours owing to the fact that 9CR sits due north of its only close neighbour and therefore no issues of deprivation of light or overshadowing arose. The existing extension to 1PL approved by ADC in 2005 already created a substantial family residence comprising 5 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms which the current owners purchased in 2017. We remain of the view that in addition to the very detrimental impact which the proposed upper floor extensions to 1PL would have on our living conditions, it also represents an overdevelopment skewed to its northern boundary on the upper floor level which will dwarf 9CR and be inappropriate for a narrow site of its size.

We should be very grateful if you would take our views into consideration when deciding this application.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew H Duncan

Laura C M T O’Connor