

Comments for Planning Application 24/00814/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 24/00814/FUL

Address: Timber Cottage Lumley Road Southbourne Emsworth West Sussex PO10 8AF

Proposal: Replacement dwelling.

Case Officer: Emma Kierans

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Ommanney

Address: Rookery Cottage, Lumley Road, Southbourne Emsworth, West Sussex PO10 8AF

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: It is extremely depressing and stressful that we, and our neighbours, have to object once again to a proposal that would massively blight our lives if approved.

Despite changes to the layout, and a minimal lowering of the height, this application seems little changed in its essentials from the previous application that was refused. It still represents an absolute disaster for its neighbours whose legitimate concerns clearly do not bother the applicants.

The Design and Access statement claims to address the reasons why the previous application was unsuccessful. It states that the previous design, as viewed from Lumley Road, appeared as a "2-storey dwelling". But in the new plan it still does. Stating that the proposed building is a "1.5 story bungalow" (and later even calling it a "Chalet bungalow") seems a somewhat misleading description of a 2-storey house. It would be over twice the height of the actual bungalow it plans to replace.

In refusing the previous application (23/02690/FUL) the Decision Notice of 9-2-24 states that the replacement dwelling by reason of its scale, height and massing would cause significant harm and detriment to the street scene and wider area, and would result in an overbearing and oppressive form of development to the neighbouring properties to the north, west, and south. Furthermore the first floor windows on the front elevation would result in a loss of privacy for the neighbouring property to the west.

Absolutely nothing in this new application has significantly changed the reasons given above for refusing the previous application.

Currently we enjoy complete privacy in our garden. It's where we eat and relax in the summer. We are not overlooked at all. This new building would overlook us completely. The architect points out that in a previous successful application the first floor had windows overlooking us, as if that makes it all ok. But, as many have pointed out, that successful application (20/01475/FUL) was unlikely to have been approved if a comprehensive site visit had been made at the time to see at

first hand the impact it would have on its neighbours.

Anyone pausing at the driveway of Timber Cottage can see that it fits snugly in an open space with views of distant trees. A similar view can be seen by anyone emerging from the Nature Reserve opposite The Rookery. That open view would be gone for ever.

In an attempt to justify cramming a large house into an inappropriate space the architect claims that: "Whilst the location has a rural feel by virtue of the open Peter Pond to the west, the dwellings are quite close together and have a much more urban level of overlooking than a walk along Lumley Road might suggest." Anyone who lives in this stretch of Lumley Road will know that is simply not true.

The statement includes diagrams that purport to illustrate that "the proposed building by virtue of its heights, form and position in relation to the neighbours will have little effect on the sunlight / shadows on adjoining owners' land." It goes on to state: "We have significantly reduced the bulk and mass of the building and carried out sunlight studies (p 14) to prove there will be minimal impact on light from a replacement dwelling in this location." Sunlight studies? Minimal impact? We have photos, taken on a sunny morning from the living rooms and kitchen of our neighbours in The Rookery that graphically show how morning sunlight that is currently enjoyed by them will be completely obscured by the proposed building.

In an email to the previous architect Queenie Cheng on Feb 1st (that outlined the reasons for refusal) Emma Kierans, the Planning Officer, made clear that significant concerns around the impact on street scene and neighbouring properties could not be addressed by simply amending the proposal. Simply amending the proposal is exactly what this new application has done. It's very frustrating that the applicants didn't take that first refusal seriously and have simply offered, basically, more of the same. If they are hoping for scenic views from upstairs they may be unaware of a planning stipulation imposed on the previous successful application that windows that overlook neighbours will have to have obscured glass, like a bathroom. In other words, they'd have no view at all. If that is the case it surely seems obvious that Timber Cottage should be replaced by another bungalow. What an opportunity that would be to design something truly stylish. The garden is big enough to spread the footprint and allow more ground level living space. It need be no higher than the bungalow it replaces, and would consequently respect the privacy and light of its neighbours. And it would preserve that open vista. I'm sure the entire community would welcome such a plan with open arms.