John Addicott
9 George V Avenue
Lancing
West Sussex
BN15 8NG

02 April 2025

Reference: AWDM/0199/25

Dear Sir/Madam,
I would like to comment/object to the retrospective planning application (AWDM/0199/25) for a front extension at 11 George V Avenue (GVA) on the following grounds:

1. **Loss of Light:** The previously existing frontage of the semi detached properties of numbers 9 and 11 GVA were built, from an aerial view, in an "H" shape. Each had a partially glazed front door with transparent windows either side of the door and an additional transparent window on the side or the building thus allowing a good level of natural daylight to enter the properties. The building of a 3.3m front extension at 11 GVA has significantly reduced the amount of natural daylight now entering the hallway and main living room. The negative impact that the extension has on the described areas is evidenced by the fact that the extension has had transparent skylight installed to allow natural daylight to enter.

2. **Design, Appearance, Materials, Character:** The previous open and light entrance areas to both 9 and 11 GVA provided open access and egress to the property with good visual connectivity to the street, a sense of community and a feeling of safety. Now, with a 3.3m front extension protruding from 11GVA, there is a significant sense of enclosure, overshadowing, and compromised safety to 9GVA particularly at night. Lastly, the box like extension completely changes the original design and character of the adjoining properties.

3. **Other:** With regard to the retrospective planning application itself, I have the following comments

    a. **Description of Proposed Works;**
        i. The extension reaches 3.3m from the original buildings front door rather than the 3m stated.
        ii. The actual date when the work started was w/c 09/12/24 not 11/02/25 as stated.
        iii. There is no mention that the works include the demolition of the existing front door, windows, and some supporting brickwork (reference A482-1 and A482-2 in the application) at 11GVA. It is my understanding that building control should have been made aware of this and that appropriate load bearing calculations should have been made by the owners of 11GVA to ensure the health and safety of the owners/occupiers of 9GVA. The builders advised me that this had not been done.

**b. Reference Properties (A482-7)**

i. It is not true to say that "over time, a majority of homes have had porches of some form added to the front elevation". A review on Google Earth shows that under 50% of the 44 properties have had a porch/extension added and that only 5 have had a near comparable front extension to that at 11GVA. Of the other 15 porches the majority of those are approximately 3sqm and have glass/Perspex roofs to enable light to penetrate the original porch area thus highlighting the loss of natural daylight that these structures cause.

ii. **Picture upper LHS:** This example shows 21GVA with a large single story frontal extension (AWDM/1396/17) with the entrance moved to the side of the property. Number 23GVA, attached to the property, also has an extension which mitigates, to an extent, the feeling of enclosure etc.

iii. **Picture lower RHS:** This example shows 22GVA with a large frontal extension (L/210/89/TP5358) approval for which was refused. The extension on number 24GVA is not an equivalent size to that already built at 11GVA. I suggest that this makes these examples invalid.

iv. **Picture lower LHS:** This example shows numbers 25 and 27 GVA with frontal extensions neither of which has planning permission despite being provided as evidence of properties with approved similar works. I suggest that this makes these examples also invalid.

**c. Additional Comments**

i. **Due regard to Planning Process:** Prior to and throughout the build period of this unapproved frontal extension the owner and builder have chosen, in my opinion and for whatever reason, not to follow due process regarding The Party Wall Agreement or Planning Approval. Following my initial complaint to the council (AWEN/0257/24), and subsequent site visit by the planning office personnel, work continued on the extension despite the planning office being told that work would cease and a planning application made. My main concerns here are that
a). The building of such extensions without approval becomes commonplace because people are seen to be able to do it.
b). This has not allowed for any building control assessment of the work to be made, particularly with regard to the removal of the original doors, windows, and supporting brickwork of 11GVA and its potential safety impact on the structural integrity 9GVA.

John Addicott (Mr)