12 Edburton Gardens
Shoreham-By-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5GR

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

ADUR & WORTHING
5 DEC 2019
PLANNING SERVICES

28 November 2019

Dear Ms Barker,

Planning Applications
AWDM/1387/19 Single storey rear extension
13 Edburton Gardens, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5GR

As agreed between Mr Gary Peck and my mother Mrs Fry during yesterday's telephone conversation, please find enclosed for your records a copy of my letter dated 27th September 2019 relating to the above planning application, the original of which was enclosed in the envelope with my letter relating to planning application AWDM/1380/19 received on 30th September 2019.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Malcolm G. L. Fry

Enc

Copy Letter

12 Edburton Gardens
Shoreham-By-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5GR

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

27 September 2019

Dear Ms Barker,

Proposal: Single Storey Rear Extension
13 Edburton Gardens, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5GR
Reference AWDM/1387/19

Thank you for your letter regarding the above proposal dated 10th September 2019.

Please receive objection due to the following considerations.

1. Plans to protect and allow service of the rear sewer are insufficiently detailed
   a. Building such a rear extension requires building over the sewer that runs across the back of the properties. The integrity of the sewer has to be considered when planning the foundations for the rear extension.
      i. It seems likely the floor or even the wall of the rear extension will be over the manhole cover that is in line with the west wall of the property. It is important to ensure that the construction work does not disturb, even after settling, the operation of this sewer, as this affects all three properties no's 11, 12 & 13.
      ii. Any blockage under or as a result of the rear extension could lead to waste water backing up to no. 12, that is rain and waste from all three properties
   b. In this area, due to the hillside to rear, it appears a large part of the rainwater run off flows into the sewers along with the soil waste so the flow volume can be high and the impact of any blockages severe.
   c. There is evidence that sewer flow is from west to east rather than east to west –
      i. Direction of lay of pipes entering sewer at no 12
      ii. Position of manhole cover to north east of soil and wastewater pipes at no. 12
      iii. Recollection from previous owners of no. 13
      iv. Existence of cover at east end of no. 13, into which otherwise there would be no obvious flow from no 13, and hence no need for such a cover.
   d. Upstream access to the sewer would be from no. 12 only rather than directly at no 13. The cover at the east of no 13 will provide access from downstream only.

Copy Letter

2. Height of sloping roof of rear extension is too great, to over 1m above the garden fence.
   a. A lower profile roof slope similar to the existing rear conservatory at no. 13 would be more acceptable, even at any of the three properties no's 11, 12 and 13.
   b. The higher sloping roof detracts from the secluded nature of the character of the properties.
   c. If done to the rear of no's 11 and 12 this higher profile would block significantly the very pleasant evening light to the back of the properties to the east – 12 and 13 respectively.
   d. Consistency of design is important to the character of the three properties
   e. It is felt that such a planning application at no 12 would not be appreciated by those at no. 13.

It is noted that the foundations to the rear extension are within 3m of the building at no. 12 and so Party Wall notice is required.

Thank you for considering this in connection with the Application 1387.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm G L Fry

cc Building Control