...ORTHING
25 APR 2016
PLA... ...ICES

Jonathan and Paula Sargent

6 North Point, Emerald Quay, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5JX.

Phone [redacted]

Monday, 18 April 2016

Adur District Planning Department

Dear Ms Hearsey

Re: Our planning application AWDM/0504/16

We write this letter in response to an e-mail to you from Mr G Williams of 4 North Point, Emerald Quay, dated 15 April 2016. In that e-mail, Mr Williams made a number of points and claims and we wish to comment on and correct the accuracy of his statements.

Specifically:

1. Mr Williams' paragraph 2: We are not *The apparent owners*, we are the leaseholders of 6 North Point and have been so for 20 years.
2. Mr Williams' paragraph 3: We are pleased to note that Mr Williams has *no objection ... to the indicated improvement of their balconies (GW para 2).*
3. Mr Williams' paragraph 3: The comments on external conformity and the condition of Mr Williams' balcony are irrelevant to this application. The issue of repair and refurbishment of the balconies at North Point is a matter for the management company of Emerald Quay (V&S No.3 Ltd), its agents (Applewood) and the company who own the freehold (Emerald Quay Freeholders). The issue of maintenance and repair of the other nine balconies in North Point has no bearing on our planning application and, with the greatest of respect, is not the business or responsibility of ADC. I am therefore at a loss to see why Mr Williams makes this point. In any case, our proposal conforms to the current fenestration pattern of the existing balconies.
4. Mr Williams' paragraph 4: For clarity, the management company is currently collecting funds from leaseholders towards the repair and maintenance of the existing balconies as per the lease (see our point 5 below). Our point above confirms that our application conforms entirely to the current balcony design including glazing bars in the lower panels. This design was approved by ADC planning for our replacement windows in 2012 and hundreds of others across Emerald Quay.
5. Mr Williams' paragraph 5: We are unaware of *dramas* on Emerald Quay. Inevitably, on an estate whose management company is owned by and for 200 leaseholders, there will occasionally be some who disagree with majority decisions made according to protocol by the Council of Management, the executive arm of the V&S No3 Ltd.
6. Mr Williams' paragraph 7: Mr Williams is completely incorrect in thinking that he will have any financial commitment to our proposed planning application. Should the application be approved, the funding of the project will be entirely ours. By replacing

one of the balconies in the block we will of course reduce the amount of future repair and refurbishment costs. Refurbishment costs are of course shared by all in the block and so our project will reduce the overall financial burden on all residents.

7. Mr Williams' paragraph 8: I am indeed proud to be the chair of V&S No.3, the management company. It is also true that the management company and its agents, Applewood are reviewing the repair of many of the rotten balconies of the block, as they have done over the past twelve months for other blocks on Emerald Quay. It is also true that the company is investigating all options from repair to replacement. Should replacement with **any** variation from the original design be countenanced, ADC has my absolute assurance that the company would involve the Council Planning Dept. in our thinking at the earliest of stages. At the moment, we are simply looking at options. I refute entirely any suggestion that my position as Chair of V&S No3 Ltd is in any conflict with this planning application.
8. For the record, our proposed enclosure would replace a rotten balcony. This proposal has the support of all three concerned companies (V&S, Applewood and EQF). As noted above, any such enclosure would be totally at our expense thus would lessen any future communally shared repair to the balconies. Our proposal will save Mr Williams and other leaseholders money.
9. We do not believe that any of the points Mr Williams raises are in any way germane to our application.

Yours sincerely

[redacted] [redacted]

Jonathan & Paula Sargent

From: **Gary Williams** [redacted]
Subject: Ref: AWDM/0504/16 Enclosure of Balcony. 4th. Floor at 6, North Point. Emerald Quay. Shoreham Beach.
Date: 15 April 2016 at 5:01 pm
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

For the attention of:-

Eve Hearsey,
Adur and Worthing Councils
Development Management.

From Mr. G. Williams, 4 North Point, Emerald Quay. (1st. Floor).

Dear Eve Hearsey,

1 In response to a letter from **Gary Peck,** Planning Services Mgr., 8th. April 2016, Ref: AWDM/0504/16.

2 The apparent owners of **No. 6, North Point (Mr & Mrs J Sargent)** I understand wish to make indicated improvements to their balconies.

3 I probably have no objection to this as their flat is out of view from my flat. However Mr Sargent himself indicated to me that our North Point Block must conform externally.
To my surprise he has suggested (Along with Applewood Property Management here at E.Q.) that my perfectly satisfactory Balcony should be changed to conform with the general outlook of the Block / Emerald Quay Complex.
This it does, of course currently, but presumably will not if / when Mr Sargent's balconies are completed.

4 **Currently Mr Sargent. Chairman of (V & S No.3 Ltd) here at E. Q. and Philip Long, (Director of Applewood Property Management Ltd)** are pressing for a Block Payment reflecting advanced funds towards the cost of changing the balconies, presumably to match up in some way to Mr Sargents proposed new balconies.

5 This situation is currently now another on going drama here at Emerald Quay.

6 Ms Hearsey I thought this should be brought to your attention as it may effect this Planning Application.

7 Though it is my problem as to should I help Mr & Mrs Sargent pay for their proposed new Balconies I am fairly sure your dept. will be interested in how the North Point Block and the EQ Complex may look should this application go ahead.

8 I look forward to your observations. You may not be able to help on the following point, but I do wonder that by Mr Sargent being V & S No. 3 Chairman, it raises some conflict in these balcony proceedings?

You will note I have copied this communication to both Mr J Sargent and to Mr P. Long.