




From: Adam King [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 November 2019 17:08
To: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning Application R/230/19/PL - Springfield House, Springfield Close, Rustington, BN16 2SZ - Objection

Dear Anita,

Further to my objection to the above Planning Application, I note on your website in your response to the Agent that this will be dealt with under delegated powers.

Could I please ask what the threshold is in terms of objections to take the Application to Committee? If this relates to ward member, could you advise who this is so that I can open a dialogue with the relevant member?

I would reiterate my offer for you to visit our property to consider the impact of the first floor accommodation on the proposed triple garage block which will directly overlook our private garden.


Thanks.

Kind Regards,

Adam King BA (Hons) BArch RIBA
Director

ECE Architecture

We are excited to reveal our new #apiECEofourmind video which captures the creative culture at ECE. The video was filmed across all three of our offices in July. Click [here](#) to watch the full video.



Brooklyn Chambers, 11 Goring Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN12 4AP.


Privacy/Confidentiality Statement

www.ecearchitecture.com

ECE Architecture Limited, Registered in England No 02360005, Registered Office Anella House, Grosport Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 1QR.

From: Adam King

Sent: 04 November 2019 18:04

To: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning Application R/230/19/PL - Springfield House, Springfield Close, Rustington, BN16 2SZ - Objection

Dear Anita,

I tried today to submit an Objection to the above Application, but when I submitted there was no confirmation.

I wanted to make sure that this objection was registered as we are the neighbouring property and will be significantly affected by this proposal particularly in terms of overlooking to our secluded garden. The objection that I submitted reads 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.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this objection. I would also be happy if you wanted to visit our property and see for yourself how our garden will be impacted by the building location and the overlooking that it will have.

I look forward to hearing from you.