8 July 2015

Hannah Barker
Adur & Worthing Councils
Development Management
Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1HS

Mr T F G Holter &
Mrs J A Holter
15 Victoria Road
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5LA

[redacted]

ADUR & WORTHING
- 9 JUL 2015
PLANNING SERVICES

Dear Ms Barker

Single-storey rear extension to north elevation.
13 Victoria Road, Shoreham by Sea, BN43 5LA

Planning application reference: AWDM/0841/15

We wish to raise objections to the scale of this proposal submitted by Alan and Diane Berwick, the owners of our adjoining semi-detached house.

The principle cause of our concern is that the proposed extension would be built on the common boundary and extends two metres to the north beyond our own rear single storey extension, i.e. five metres from the rear of the main two storey building.

The rear elevation facing north is sensitive to light restrictions. Lack of light is already an issue in the centre of our ground floor. The northern elevation faces east of north and therefore benefits from the low early morning sunlight upon our patio which facilitates alfresco breakfast dining in summer. Also early low sunlight penetrates into the rear of the house throughout the year. In summer we enjoy sunlight on the patio until late morning. The proposed extension, although only a single storey high, due to its close proximity will detrimentally block sunlight and cast shade in the morning and shade our rear ground floor living room from ambient light throughout the day. Therefore this will have a significant impact on our enjoyment of our rear facilities and exacerbate the lack of light in our dining room and kitchen, which are in the centre of the house.

The two metres of extension projecting along the boundary beyond our rear wall and next to our patio will dominate by having a high overbearing and oppressive impact upon enjoyment of our patio and rear room which is used as a 'conservatory'/ office. It will have an adverse impact upon our visual amenity from our rear ground floor room and patio.

Development Control Standard No.2 provides for a 45 degree angle of view from adjacent rear windows which would be breached by this 5 metre extension on the boundary. We estimate the rear-most 2 metres of the proposed extension would need to be five to six feet from the common boundary to meet that standard or at least one and a half metres shorter. Although still not ideal for us that would lessen the impact on the overbearing factor and view but possibly will not reduce the restriction on direct sunlight/ambient light due to the height of the pitched roof if the proposed centre line of the pitch was retained.

Our rear window is 1.1 metre from the east corner of our extension.

We note that 'Development Control Standard No.3' clause: 3.2 states that single storey extensions abutting a boundary should be no deeper than 3.5 metres. The original small 1920s projecting sections (not on the common boundary side) are 2.9 metres deep. That is the depth of

our extension and we would prefer that building line to be retained as a maximum when building abutting the boundary. Around the block of twenty originally identical houses (ten semi-detached constructions), several properties have had the rear infilled with single storey extensions abutting the common boundary. These appear to respect the 1920s 2.9 metre deep rear building line.

Two (39 Victoria Rd & 4 Swiss Gdns) and possibly a third (1 Swiss Gdns) have extensions of about 5 metres but they do not abut the common boundary. 39 Victoria Road appears to be about two metres from the boundary and lies to the north of the adjacent dwelling thereby not restricting sunlight. The other two appear to be at least three metres from the common boundary and spring from the light southern side of the properties.

Upon construction and first sale and carried forward in subsequent deeds the 1927 conveyance contains a restrictive covenant limiting the height of rear walls/fencing to seven feet.

We would not raise objection to a 2.9/3 metre extension from the main two storey building to match our own. We would not object to a longer extension if the rear-most part was constructed at a suitable pitch height and reasonable distance away from the common boundary such that the loss of direct morning sunlight, shading, dominating and visual impact was eliminated.

Finally, our extension was built before our time, possibly forty years ago. Jenny took occupation twenty six years ago. Our east wall was built several inches our side of the common boundary. Ideally the two extensions (No. 13 and 15) would have shared a common party wall along the boundary. As this is not the case this probably raises building control issues concerning access for maintenance and rain water drainage as an inaccessible void will be created. Hopefully there is a solution to that issue.

And also, if an extension deeper than 2.9 metres is permitted on the boundary we are concerned that the combination of building along the common boundary and under a pitched roof will result in gutters overhanging on our side of the boundary. We do not consider that overhang acceptable and it would be inconvenient and potentially detrimental if the gutters leaked or overflowed into an inaccessible void between the extensions and onto our patio.

We trust that these matters can be suitably resolved to everyone's' satisfaction as we wish our neighbours well in maximising the accommodation space potentially available.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Ps: The low brick wall near the common boundary belongs to us and was built on our side of the boundary line before our time.