Fwd: re 72 Old Fort Road

1 message

Hannah Barker <hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 26 May 2018 at 07:23
To: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Attached for indexing. Objection. 72 Old Fort rd.
Hannah

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Peter Jarman** [redacted]
Date: Thursday, 24 May 2018
Subject: re 72 Old Fort Road
To: Hannah Barker <hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Hannah

Following on from our meeting earlier this week, I now attach my objections to the amended plans submitted on 1st May 2018 for you to include within the portal.

I have annexed the first letter for ease of reference but please feel free to exclude this if necessary

Kind regards

Peter

[redacted]

PETER & DEBBIE JARMAN

74 OLD FORT ROAD

SHOREHAM BY SEA

WEST SUSSEX

BN43 5HA

24th May 2018

Dear Hannah

Following on from the submission of amendments to the plans to 72 Old Fort Road AWDM/0464/18 on 1st May 2018 I continue to object to the planning application as it seems that the amendments have not addressed any of the issues that I raised in my letter of 19th April 2018.

This reply should be read in conjunction with my letter of objection of 19th April 2018 (annexed for ease of reference).

I live next door on the east side of 72 Old Fort Road and continue to object to the amended application on the following grounds:

1 LOSS OF LIGHT

2 OVERBEARING

3 OVERLOOKING /PRIVACY

4 DESIGN

1 Loss of Light and overbearing issues affecting living room. (point 1 in my letter of 19/4/18)

The increased depth of the property on the east side – 8m to 13m over two storeys is overbearing and will almost entirely eliminate natural daylight into my living room on north west side of my property.

The cosmetic and unnecessarily large eaves on the east and west side of the property only add to the loss of light issues.

My suggestion is that the footprint of the proposed house goes no further north on the east side that the current main building to allow natural light into our dining room.

2 Overlooking - Privacy Issues as a result of raising the property and patio on south side of the property. (point 2 of my letter of 19th April 2018)

The plans still fail to show that the surrounding area of the swimming pool has already been raised and by including a new 3 metre patio extending southwards from the rear of the property, the whole of the garden will be raised by 40cm on the east side causing overlooking issues into my south and west facing windows, living room and garden.

It is not clear whether the pathway down the east side of the property would also be raised causing further overlooking issues.

I note that the architect accepts that there are overlooking/privacy issued from ground floor side windows on the east side and now includes obscure glazing but suggest that these are **non-opening windows** to avoid overlooking issues.

My suggestion is that if the internal ground floor needs to be raised by 30cm for flood risk reasons, the area between the south side of the building and swimming pool surround should not be raised to help alleviate overlooking privacy issues.

3 OVERBEARING Roof Mass & Height of Chimneys –

Point 3 of my letter of 19/4/18 still apply

4 Boundary clarifications

Point 4 of my letter of 19th April 18 still apply and there is still no indication of how high the boundary wall will be and how access to my garage windows will be maintained.

6 Overall Size-Design- Over development of site – Point 6 of my letter of 19/4/18 still apply

Whilst the architect suggests a symmetrically designed property for the plot, this totally ignores the effect of the neighbouring properties. The building standing is not symmetrical and not rectangular for a reason; it takes into account the non-symmetrical aspects of the neighbouring properties.

My suggestion is the symmetrical design is abandoned in favour of a non symmetrical design that blends in better with surrounding properties.

A house of similar size to the current design could be achieved without having such severe loss of light, overbearing and overlooking issues by being more imaginative with the design.

My suggestion is that whilst a symmetrical design may be the right design for some plots, the nature and design of the neighbouring properties means that this plot is not suitable for such a design. I suggest that the symmetry is dropped in favour of a more neighbourly design. **As a guide, the footprint of the current two storey building should be used as the basis of the two storey footprint for the new build as this better suits the issues of loss of light and overbearing of neighbouring properties.**

Summary

The amendments made in this revised plan do not address the issues raised in my original objections. A token 40 cm increase in the gaps between the neighbouring properties does next to nothing to alleviate the loss of light issues, the vastly increased width of the property and the overbearing design of the property.

My summary in my letter of 19th April 2018 still stands true and I now feel that the best way to alleviate the effects on neighbouring properties would be to drop the symmetrical design in favour of a design that is more sympathetic to neighbouring properties. It just takes a bit of imagination!

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Peter & Debbie Jarman

APPENDIX 1

PETER & DEBBIE JARMAN

74 OLD FORT ROAD

SHOREHAM BY SEA

WEST SUSSEX

BN43 5HA

19th April 2018

Dear Sir

I live next door on the east side of 72 Old Fort Road AWDM/0464/18 and wish to object to the current application on the following grounds:

1 Loss of Light.

By extending the current main building footprint length by approximately 5 metres on the north east side from 8 metres long to 13 metres long over two storeys, I will lose my right to all natural light into my dining room window as shown on the form 350-449\400-72 Old Fort Road\planning application site plan (1).

At present I have natural light coming into the room through an angle of approximately 90 degrees; however, if the proposed development goes ahead I will have next to no direct natural light into the dining room window as there will be a two storey wall directly in front of the whole window and the proposed larger overhangs from the roof will restrict any further light coming in from above.

When 72 Old Fort Road was originally extended to two storeys on the east side around 18 years ago one of the stipulations was that the wall on the east side remained a light colour. The dark colour of the cladding on the current plans will only increase the loss of light into our dining room.

The proposed increase in the gap between the buildings of some 40 cm will make little or no difference to the natural light coming into our west side windows as the design of the proposed roof and large overhang will take away all that light.

My suggestion is that the footprint of the proposed house goes no further north on the east side that the current main building to allow natural light into our dining room.

In addition, at present, the plans are proposing a 1.4m gap between the east and west side of the building but they are not taking into account the loss of light from the new proposed roof design with large overhangs.

My suggestion is that if the roof design is kept as it is with very large overhangs on the east and west side, then any gap between the boundary on the east and west side of the proposed house should be measured from the edge of the new roof including allowance for guttering rather than from the ground so that the loss of light is less affected.

Finally, the colour of the cladding should be light to allow more reflective light into our windows on the east side of the building.

2 Overlooking - Privacy Issues

The summary by the architect says that there is no re-design to the rear garden, however the plans indicate a new 3 metre patio extending southwards from the rear of the property raised by 0.6m across the whole of the south side of the plot.

The level of the rear garden has already been increased by around 40cm following putting in the swimming pool and raising the rear garden grassed area. Drawing number "JB400/ Planning 08" is **inaccurate** as it does not reflect that the surrounding areas of the swimming pool is already raised by around 30cms and now by raising the whole ground floor by 0.6 m and introducing a new patio will mean that my south and west facing windows, living room and garden will be overlooked. In addition, if the building is raised by 60 cm, then the side two windows on the ground floor east side will look directly into my sunroom window from above. To keep any privacy, I would need fences of at least 9-10ft high on the east side. Drawing no JB 400/ planning 08 does not indicate that the passage way on the border of the east side of the property is to be raised but without this being raised there will be at least a 0.6m step down to the path. If it is raised it will cause more overlooking of my property.

The raising of the ground floor for flooding purposes seems unnecessary given that other new builds on the foreshore have very recently lowered the height of the ground floor presumably without a significant flood risk. (See No 44 Old Ford Road for example).

As I understand it, from the flood report there is no requirement to raise the building and the proposed 0.6m raising of the building is only for cosmetic purposes.

The current building is already raised by around 0.4 m at the front with steps up to the front door while the rear patio doors are close to ground level so depending on where ground level, front or rear this might mean that the property will be elevated by up to 1m. **This needs to be clarified in the drawings.**

I note that in the application it states that the rear (south facing garden will remain as is but if steps are included from the raised door entrances, then in effect the whole of the rear garden will increase in height to the height of the raised swimming pool. This would cause an overlooking issue.

My suggestion is that the building is not raised by 60cm, the side windows on the ground floor east side are removed and the balconies have screening on the east and west side to avoid overlooking.

3 Height of Chimneys

The current building is already one of the highest along Old Fort Road and the proposed plans suggest an increase on this level. However, the building will appear much higher when you consider the vastly increased size of the new roof and the extra height created by two large chimneys.

In my opinion, the maximum height of the building should also take into account Chimneys if they are large and imposing.

4 Boundary clarifications

There is a straight line boundary on the east side of 72 Old Fort Road with a clear gap between our garage, low garden wall and the boundary line. We have allowed, but not permitted, part of the gap

to be filled with soil in the front garden but we do need to be able to access between the garages to be able to clean windows facing west on our garage.

6 Overall Size- Over development of site

The original building has already been extended to the east and west in the past to occupy the whole width of the plot. In addition, the original garages have been turned into a self-contained annexe and a new triple garage has been built. All of these additions have, as the architect points out, increased the size and appearance in a negative way.

The new build proposal takes all those incremental increases in size and volume and increases it yet again by more than 10%.

The architect's design and assessment statement suggest that the proposed building will increase only increase by 10%, however this is quite misleading as it includes all the existing building including the lean-to conservatory while the proposed new built leaves out areas like the enclosed and covered balcony on the first floor. The new building is symmetrical and the ground floor is the same size as the first floor however the calculations in the architect's statement shows the first floor as being 29sq m smaller. If the true size is included the increase in size is 18%. From the east side of the property the increase in the depth of the proposed new building is over 60% of the original depth going from 8m to 13m.

The design offers a token 40cm less width to increase the depth by 5 metres.

This is overdevelopment of the property and detrimental to the overall impression of the property.

Summary

Over the years 72 Old Fort Road has been extended upwards and outwards affecting the two houses either side of the property with loss of light, privacy and overlooking issues.

The "Design and access statement" prepared by the architect suggests that by increasing the gaps between the adjoining properties by a mere 40 cms, this makes it more neighbourly, but it fails to mention that the depth of the house will increase by over 5 metres on the east side, the height will also increase, the large eaves will overhang the adjourning properties, all of which cause a loss of light and the raising of the ground level will cause even more overlooking issues. I can assure you as a neighbour this is not at all neighbourly as the proposed plan simply increases these problems for neighbouring properties. It does not take into account that both adjoining properties have living room windows on the side of their properties that will be affected if a new building is build two stories high across the whole of the plot.

From my point of view, living in 74 Old Fort Road, I would be left with a vastly increased two storey dark clad wall right next to the west side of my property extending northwards by in excess of 5 metres cutting out virtually all direct natural sunlight into the two habitable room windows on the west side of my property. Whilst the proposed building might be 40 cm further away it will be taller and longer with dark coloured cladding and any benefit from moving the building further away will be lost by the large overhanging eaves designed for the roof.

The proposed raising of the building by 60cm along with the raised patio at the rear of the property will in effect mean that windows on the east side of the proposed property and virtually the whole

of the garden will now be overlooking into the windows of our rooms on the west side of our property and the only way that we could alleviate this would be to raise the fences higher to around 10 ft. but this, in turn, would be more loss of light.

I think that little or no care or attention has been made in these plans to the adverse effects on the neighbours of the adjoining properties, the current plan simply ignores the loss of light, privacy and overlooking issues caused by increasing the footprint and raising the building, windows have been included that will look directly into our habitable rooms and, even the colour of the building has an adverse effect on these issues.

I am not an architect to comment professionally on the drawings, but I can see that there are a number of inaccuracies and issues with the drawings that also need to be addressed:

1 Drawing no JB 400/ planning no 8:

A) Plan of Rear garden (South) is inaccurate as it fails to show raised level of swimming pool
B) Pool house has disappeared. No indication on where this will move to.
C) No plan for access from the raised patio in rear garden to the side passageways
D) No indication of where and how high boundary walls/ fences will be between the properties.

2 Drawing no JB400/ planning 11

A) Patio does not show raised pool area
B) Drawing indicates side passage on east side is raised by 0.6 m but there is no mention of this in other drawings.

3 Drawing no JB 400/ planning 02

A) This indicates that the main building recessing in the middle of the north side property, but in fact the North Facing Balcony protrudes.

4 Drawing no JB400/planning 12

A) This is misleading as it tries to show that the annexe on the west side of the existing building is on the east side to try and mask the vast increase in depth of the proposed property on the east side.
B) Seems to indicate that the proposed new building will protrude further south beyond the building line when compared to the existing building.
C) Outline of existing building is misleading as glass conservatory is shown on east side view when it has no bearing on that side of the building.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Peter & Debbie Jarman