Gmail by Google

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

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0034/19

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 30 January 2019 at 19:02
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 7:02 PM on 30 Jan 2019 from Mrs Natalie Woodford.

Application Summary

Address: 69 Overhill Southwick Brighton West Sussex BN42 4WH

Proposal: Hip to gable roof extension to rear (West) roofslope with Juliet Balcony; hip to part gable to (front) East roofslope (with window); North and South facing side dormers.

Case Officer: Marie O'Keeffe

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Natalie Woodford

Email: [redacted]

Address: 71 Overhill, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex BN42 4WH

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: FAO: Marie O' Keeffe
With regard to the current planning application for 69 Overhill ref: AWDM/0988/18
We would like to submit the following for reference to, and consideration of, as part of the planning application.

1. We have been led to believe that the true size of the proposed North Side Dormer is in fact 2.2mx 2.9mx 4m = 12.76m3
And not 4.77m as the current online plan shows. This needs clarity and amendment on the application, as an extra 0 .77 m will make a significant difference to us.

2. Windows to the North Side Dormer will be obscured, as they face onto a shared driveway and they will have top opening only windows to ensure privacy across the driveway.

Although we are pleased that the size of the North Side Dormer has been reduced to 4m we do still feel

that this in combination with a built up rear hip to gable end will reduce light into our habitable bedroom at the rear of our property. This 'double' extending of the roof, to the side and rear, was part of our initial objection and we still feel that our concerns have not been fully addressed.

As set out in her letter to Cllr Simmonds, Julia Mitchell ,MSc MRTPI, Planner
for and on behalf of Stiles Harold Williams Partnership LLP originally stated that:

The amenity of No. 71 will be compromised due to the reduction in sunlight and the overshadowing impact of the dormer, which 'squares off' the roof and will significantly reduce the sunlight which can reach the south elevation of No.71. Habitable rooms are located along the south elevation of No.71, and the amenity of these rooms must be protected.

Building up the western gable end to a vertical position will have an additional detrimental impact on when sunlight will be able to reach the habitable rooms along the south elevation of No.71, as they will see a reduction in afternoon/evening sunlight from the west, though the proposed western roof extension

If Eastern, principle elevation of the property was extended, this would have a lesser impact on obstructing light which enters the key habitable rooms of No.69, including the lounge and a bedroom.

So in summary, If the building up of the hip to gable end were to be at the front of the property it would not reduce our light into habitable areas, as we have none of those at the front of our property and across the shared driveway and we do not understand why this cannot be considered especially as a precedent for such a construction has been made in recent times at 78 Overhill.
The new proposal still has an impact although the smaller Dormer size will reduce the impact somewhat.

We would also like to request that a planning condition is attached to any consented permission which states that a clear vehicular and pedestrian access is maintained for our property at all times. That where possible, a space be left on the road outside our property, where we could park our car, as Mr Woodford suffers [redacted] which reduces his mobility and causes constant pain thus making it more difficult for him to walk distances especially if carrying objects. Our road has limited parking already due to its situation on a bus route.
Furthermore we would request that the industry standards for working hours eg from 8am-6pm Monday-Friday and 8am-1pm Saturday will apply to reduce disruption.

As always we understand the need for an extension to 69 Overhill but we merely wish to achieve the best possible scenario for the applicants and ourselves,

who have to consider the irreversible impacts to our property and lifestyle.

Mr and Mrs Woodford