Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1688/16

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 12 December 2016 at 22:20
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 10:23 PM on 12 Dec 2016 from Mr Marc Lee.

Application Summary

Address:	80 Harbour Way Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HH
Proposal:	Two storey side extension to west elevation, single storey rear extension and rear dormer, front porch.
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Marc Lee
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	78 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5HH

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Other
Comments:	My comments are as follows: My main objection is that the plans use a boundary which I do not believe is correct. Therefore, it is not possible from the plans to establish the location of the proposed development. On this basis I object. The details are shown below. Having observed the comments on the plans regarding the boundary infraction by number 78, I would suggest that the boundary between the two properties is long established. I would suggest far in excess of 20 years. Any query regarding the boundary should be fully agreed using normal protocols before any work is carried out. At the front of the properties, there is an existing wall which we accept is the establish boundary. However, it is only built as far as the beginning of our garage. If this wall had been fully continued it would have naturally continued the boundary running adjacent to the easterly wall of our garage. We believe that this suggests our garage is built well within the boundary lines and not 'slightly over' as the plans would suggest. The garage is visible on the plans recorded at Land Registry since at least 1984. We would suggest that even if the garage of

number 78 had been built slightly over the boundary, due to the amount of time that has passed, this would form a new boundary line.

Either way, we believe that we are not encroaching over any established boundary line.

When considering the boundary adjacent to the easterly wall of our garage, we accept the principal that the boundary should run the full length of our garage.

At the rear of the properties I believe that the established boundary, after the end of the easterly wall of our garage, is the westerly wall of the garage of number 80 (there is approximately 12 inches between these two walls). This is true until the southern end of the garage belonging to number 80, at which point a brick wall, approximately 5 feet tall, forms the boundary to the end of the gardens. This long established boundary (by way of use over a prolonged period of time) is not a perfectly straight line as shown in the plans. The plans also suggest that the boundary and current buildings are built in perfect parallel lines, which is not the case. The land registry documents clearly demonstrate this.

I do not object to the extension in principal. I would like assurance that the boundary line is not being disputed, as implied in the plans. I would like confirmation that the proposed property will not encroach over the established boundary lines (as described here) in any way. Specifically there should be no overhang from the roof, soffits and guttering or any other part of the proposed building.

I believe that multiple party wall agreements will need to be requested by our friends at number 80.