Gmail by Google

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0092/16

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 15 February 2016 at 11:12
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 11:12 AM on 15 Feb 2016 from Dr Richard Howells.

Application Summary

Address:	40 Mill Hill Drive Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TL
Proposal:	Replacement detached garage in north-east corner of rear garden.
Case Officer:	Marie O'Keeffe

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Dr Richard Howells
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	39 Chanctonbury Drive, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5FR

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I wish to register an objection to the proposal to build a new garage at 40 Mill Hill Drive, which abuts the rear of 39 Chanctonbury Drive. I have no problem in principle with the concept of a replacement garage, and would have no objection to a replacement if it was of the same apparent size. However, the proposed garage is larger and in particular is higher overall than the current one. The lie of the land is such that the property at 40 Mill Hill Drive is higher than those in Chanctonbury Drive, and the base level of the proposed garage is already above the level of our gardens. Added to this, the height of the proposed garage is greater than the current one and the proposed roof-line will make the profile of the new garage appear significantly larger than the present one. Why not have a flat roof like all the other garages? Some

years ago approval was given for a loft extension to 40 Mill Hill Drive. At that time I objected to a proposed side window because it overlooked our gardens. The extension was approved, but with the requirement that this window was fitted with obscuring glass. Despite this, when the building work was undertaken a plain glass pane was fitted. After a complaint, an obscuring film was added to the window but after a short while this was removed. I am concerned not only that the proposed garage has a larger profile than the existing one, but also because of past difficulties in connection with planning consents at this property.