AWDW/1139/20; 60, Holmbush Way, Southwick
1 message

[redacted] 7 September 2020 at 01:16
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Jane Maguire,
Justine Czech
23 Queens Road
Southwick
Brighton
East Sussex
BN42 4RQ

6 September 2020

To Mr Gary Peck
Planning Services Manager
planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Re: Planning Application AWDW/1139/20; at 60, Holmbush Way, Southwick, Brighton

We wish to make you aware of the number of strong objections we have with regards to the proposed development of the conservatory at 60, Holmbush Way, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex , the reference number as above.
As an immediate neighbour to the site of proposed development , we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious impact on our standard of living.
Our specific objections are as follows:

1. Noise and noise related disturbance. We object the proposed structure because the use of property is likely to result in increased noise, disturbance and nuisance to the detriment of ours and other neighbours residential amenity. Mr and Mrs Prakash have had different people and children living on their property at different times for months. We have suffered for years from the excessive noise made by both adults and children who spend a lot of time in the garden shouting to each other, yelling while having lengthy conversations on mobile phones at all hours, children screaming, squabbling, crying, arguing, shouting at the top of their voices in chorus of four of five, kicking old metal bowl around the concreted garden, hanging around the boundary of the property and looking repeatedly into our garden screaming, then hiding behind the fence. The vastly extended family conducts a considerable part of their living in the back garden and all this lasts for months. We are afraid that the additional space will be used to house increased numbers of relatives or friends of the family for long periods of time, and we are concerned about the noise disturbance we will have to endure.

We would like the Council to take this point into consideration as Council has the responsibility under Human Rights Act, Protocol 1, Article 1, to respect a persons right to a quiet and private enjoyment of all their possessions which include the home and the land. The right to respect for private and family life encompasses not only home but also its surroundings.

We cannot enjoy our back bedroom without shutting all windows or enjoy our garden not only in summer but for most of the year because of the level of noise from Mr and Mrs Prakash garden, and that happens even when the family does not have other occupants staying there.

It is our opinion that the proposed extension will encourage the family to spend more time at the back of the house, creating more noise; we also worry that the additional space will be used to house more “guests”, making the noise disturbance a greater problem that it is already.

2. We oppose the proposed extension because we anticipate the invasion of privacy and being overlooked: the small area which functions as the back garden, is also used to house a rubbish container, a shed and various pieces of furniture. Because the clutter free area is by our fence, we are being frequently overlooked by adults over the fence, and by children who peep over fence and scream. The proposed extension will considerably decrease the already minimal outer space and it will inevitably make family members spend time just by our fence, overlooking our garden. The existing space between our houses is hardly enough to maintain the privacy of the nearest houses. We are convinced that the proposed extension will make the space completely insufficient for any privacy and that the further invasion of our privacy will infringe further on our right to quiet and private enjoyment of our home and garden.

3. Disturbances: We oppose the proposed development because the proposed extension is a clear example of loss of garden land without any suggested consideration to how the vastly decreased space outside will be used. The property is not only a residential one but also has a commercial use, housing the convenience store. Unfortunately, there is shop’s bin in the back garden, skip type bin which is being used all the time. Apart of being a fire and health hazard, it has a very heavy lid which while being shut, makes a loud banging noise, loud enough to raise a person from a deep sleep. At the moment bin is kept a few of yards away from the corner of our garden, but once the space outside is taken by proposed extension, it will be moved

closer to our fence. We have health and safety concerns having it so close to the fencing. As the attached photos clearly illustrate, the standards of property maintenance, residential or otherwise, leave plenty to be desired. There is also an important issue of shop's safety light which comes on late at night and shines for a long time straight into our bedrooms. The proposed structure will move the light a whole 4 meters closer, which will increase the strength and brightness of the light to an unbearable level. It already interferes with one's ability to sleep undisturbed, it will have a further detrimental effect on our sleep pattern, on our health and well being. The proposed extension has aspects which will make the existing problems far worse, as there will be increase in noise, disturbance and nuisance to the detriment of our and other neighbours' residential amenity.

4. "Cramming" and appearance. We strongly oppose the proposed extension because it will significantly contributes to "cramming" in already high density area. The proposed development is not in proportion with the building and with the type of the back extensions already in place in neighbouring houses. We use the word "extension" because the proposed term "conservatory" is misleading suggesting light and airy structure of glass/ acrylic and brick. The proposed structure is a solid extension with a tiled roof, an extension of the shape, size and character completely out of keeping with the current and adjacent development because of the its oversized and bulky proportions. It seems overbearing and especially in relation to the house next door, very un-neighbourly, without any consideration to neighbours privacy in their own garden and their available light.

5. Finally we oppose strongly the proposed development because of the detrimental effect on mature conifer tree and the established birds population which it houses.
The tree sits in the corner of the property, on the very side where the extension is proposed to be built. The large tree houses a considerable variety of wildlife in form of several species of birds. We are concerned that the size of the tree will create a poor light conditions in the proposed accommodation therefore it is likely that it will be heavily and irresponsibly pruned, which will lead to loss of wildlife. Also the proposed building could severely damage the roots of the tree, as big trees like the conifer at this property, have big roots. This would lead to the loss of the tree and its habitants. Also, the roots in future could damage the structure of the new built, leading again to the unnecessary loss of the tree and all the wildlife it houses.

We would be grateful if the Council would take our objections into consideration while deciding this application.

Sincerely,
Jane Maguire
Justine Czech