

Adam and Frances King
The Spires, 6 Springfield Close, East
Preston

BN16 2SZ

Your Ref: OWPC24756
Our Ref: R/230/19/PL 26-09-2019
Please ask for:
Mrs A Gardner

5th November 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

1 No. dwelling with detached garage (part resubmission following R/91/17/PL & R/204/18/PL).

Springfield House Springfield Close Rustington

Thank you for your internet representation made on 4th November 2019 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

Further to the site notice seen for Planning Application R/230/19/P, we write to object to the proposed relocation and significant enlargement of the garage onto the eastern boundary and to the accommodation on the first floor of the garage. We own the neighbouring property to the east of the Application site and will be directly affected by the proposal.

The existing Planning Permission locates the approved double garage well away from our western boundary, meaning that an appropriate distance is maintained between the built forms across the two dwellings and most importantly provides an area for landscaping to provide adequate visual separation between the houses. The proposed location of the garage block in this Application renders this impossible, with only a notional 1m gap to the fence boundary. The building will be highly visible from our garden given its insensitive design; a large gable will be present only 1m from the boundary as a direct result of the intent to provide accommodation at first floor; this is completely contrary to the existing consent which had a garage building with a low pitched roof to be subordinate to the main house.

The proposed building has now increased dramatically to a triple garage and first floor accommodation from the approved much smaller double garage. Positioning the new garage block as proposed will create an uncomfortable relationship with our garden and provide anyone using the bedroom above the garages the ability to look directly in a south easterly direction into our garden from any one of the 3 dormer windows proposed. Applying for additional accommodation is unnecessary in itself given the size of the approved house, and the plans suggest that this could become a self-contained annexe separate from the house. This is completely at odds with the current Planning Permission.

We believe that the proposed building has both an overbearing and overlooking impact on our property, decreasing the ability to quietly enjoy our garden. The large gable will loom ominously over our eastern boundary and be a very hard edge to the current unencumbered views of the boundary trees. We believe that the proposed garage has been 'shoehorned in' to try to (just about) avoid the trees on the northern boundary, namely Trees 16 and 17. The previous siting of the garage fully respected the RPAs of T16 and T17, but the proposed large block appears to encroach into the RPAs to a more significant degree than the Arboricultural Report would appear to suggest. No details of foundation design have been provided, however the likely strip foundations will have an effect on these trees.

To conclude, we object to the siting, scale, massing and design of the proposed garage block and additional annexe accommodation for reasons of inappropriateness, significant overlooking, overbearing impact on our garden, likely impact on Trees 16 and 17, inappropriate landscaping provision to the site boundary and most importantly the loss of privacy to our property caused by the proposed new accommodation. We would respectfully ask that the Planning Application is refused.

Unfortunately it is not possible for the council to respond to each representation individually but your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

If the application is to be determined at the Development Control Committee and your letter has been received after the agenda has been published, you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and the procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances, it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the website or telephone for further information. Please be advised that any comments received after the the Development Control Agenda has been produced will be reported to the meeting. Please also note that only a small number of all planning applications are determined at the Development Control Committee, most are determined by officers under delegated power.

All representations are published on our website so please make sure your views are clear and only include information that you are happy for the public to view. Do not include personal information or information from third parties unless you have their permission to do so. If a complaint is received that permission has not been given for comments included about a third party, the Council reserves the right to redact/remove all relevant information. Do not include information that is defamatory or breaches equality or other legislation. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the website and on the file, please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed, although this does mean that its contents will be disregarded. For details of what we do with your personal information please refer to our privacy statement comments on planning applications which is available on our website www.arun.gov.uk/planning-privacy-statements.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Neil Crowther
Group Head of Planning