Gmail by Google

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

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0056/16

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 15 March 2016 at 17:53
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 5:53 PM on 15 Mar 2016 from Mr John Williamson.

Application Summary

Address:	24 East Meadway Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RF
Proposal:	Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single-storey extension to rear of property measuring 4m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 2.780m and height of eaves of the extension 2.1m.
Case Officer:	Sarah Crease

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr John Williamson
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	26 East Meadway, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5RF

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Other - Overdevelopment
Comments:	We would be grateful if you would consider the following observations and objections before coming to a decision regarding the above Planning Application. 1. Excessive Extension Size: • The proposed 4 m deep extension would represent a 67% increase in ground floor area over and above the existing ground floor area of the property. • The proposed 4 m deep extension would represents a 40% reduction of the already very small rear garden of the property. • The proposed 4 m deep extension would be totally inappropriate and out of keeping with the other three properties of this four linked bungalow development. • The proposed 4 m deep extension would protrude by 1.2 m beyond the rear building line of this four linked property

development which was set by the 2.8 m deep extension built recently on to number 28, East Meadway. 2. Rear Garden Access: • The proposed extension plan does not allow for any access to the rear garden of the 24 East Meadway property. To achieve this, the east wall of the proposed extension would have to be moved inwards by approximately 0.7 m to facilitate a 1 m wide passageway to the rear garden. • In the event that no provision of access to the rear garden was allowed by the planning authority, the shared rear access passageway between number 24 and 26 East Meadway would no longer be valid since it would only access the rear garden of 26 East Meadway. 3. Foul Drainage: • The proposed extension plans shows the direction of foul drainage running from the west from number 26 East Meadway. This is incorrect. The foul drainage connections of the properties in this four linked property development are that numbers 22 and 24 East Meadway are linked running westward and that numbers 26 and 28 East Meadway are linked running eastward, ie. there is no foul drainage link between numbers 24 and 26 East Meadway. • Due to the very shallow depth of the existing foul drainage pipe, it would not be possible to achieve a sufficient slope of the foul pipe from the newly proposed inspection chamber to the existing foul drainage pipe connection point at the boundary of 22 East Meadway. We are aware that 24 East Meadway has suffered sewage blockages, as indeed we have, several times due to the shallow slope of the pipework. • For reference, we would also object to the location of a new Inspection Chamber as shown on the plans since it would infringe our property boundary. We trust you will understand our reasons and objections listed above to the proposed Planning Application AWDM/0056/16 and ask that you take them into consideration with your review of the proposed plans. Should you require any further details or clarification of the above points, please do not hesitate to contact us on [redacted] or by email at [redacted]