33 Clive Avenue
Goring by Sea
Worthing
West Sussex
BN12 4SG

11 August 2025

Adur and Worthing Councils
Development Management
Place Directorate
Worthing Town Hall
Chapel road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1HA

Adur & Worthing councils

14 AUG 2025

Business Support

Dear Sir/Madam

Reference: Planning application AWDM/0936/25

There are some misleading inaccuracies on the planning application drawings as follows -

A boundary brick wall is shown between No.33 and No.35 at the front, giving the impression of a permanent privacy barrier. There is no such boundary brick wall, merely five 1800mm wooden fence panels from the garage to the front of the bungalow and four lower wooden panels to the pavement.

There is a long existing Velux window to the south side of the roof which has been omitted from the drawings.

The height of the proposed extensions/conversion are not clearly shown and these need to be clarified before a decision is made.

The proposed change of use into a habitable room and alteration of the roof to the garage should be refused for the following reasons -

1. The wall dividing the garages is jointly owned. It straddles the boundary and is of single brick construction. Currently there is no agreement to the alteration to the height of our jointly owned wall.

2. The loss of privacy to our north facing elevation, particularly the bedroom which is very close to the proposed conversion.

3. The proposed new window and door to replace an up and over garage door would directly overlook our bedroom window (which is very close), our front door and secondary lounge window, all of which are located on the north elevation. This loss of privacy is unacceptable. We believe that the **45 degree rule** applies. The plans incorrectly show an existing brick wall and not the wooden fence panels currently in place. Some of the bungalows (17 and 19, 25 and 27, 29 and 31) have removed the fence panels thus reducing privacy further. It can be seen that this might happen in the future. The proposed conversion with window and door overlooking our north elevations is detrimental to the privacy of our bungalow.

4. People calling/using the proposed study/office/business would be walking directly past our bedroom window, secondary lounge window and front door to get to the new door resulting in greater footfall and further loss of privacy.

5. These are detached bungalows with conjoined garages and it is imperative to retain the detached amenity. If habitable rooms are allowed in the garages this would result in the **"Terracing effect"**. This would be significantly detrimental to the detached amenity of our bungalow.

6. The change of use from garage to habitable room would mean a substantial loss of our amenity by it being joined onto our property.

7. Furthermore it would be out of keeping with the appearance and uniformity of the bungalows in Clive Avenue. If this development was approved it would set a precedent, the character of the detached uniform bungalows would be lost. The garages should be retained to preserve the character of Clive Avenue. I refer you to your Supplementary Planning guidelines **'The use of different types of garage in a street frontage can destroy the harmony of the street scene. The use by adjoining owners of similar garages will avoid this and help the rhythm of the original house design'.**

8. The raised garage roof and false pitched roof would be overbearing and over-imposing. It would over shadow light to our bedroom window due to the proximity of the high roof. Sunlight currently comes over the roof in the afternoon. The roof risks encroachment. I refer to the Council Supplementary Planning Guidance - Extending or altering your home, which says that **'space should be left between the extension and the boundary'.** It also states **'Where possible false pitched roofs i.e. trying to conceal a flat roof behind a short sloping roof should be avoided. This is because the outer corner will be visible, revealing that it is no more than a decorative applied facing'.**

The planned utility room extension at the rear of the garage should also be refused for the following reasons -

1. The proposed extension and its height which is up to the boundary would be overbearing and over-imposing. At No.25 the extension was not built behind the garage, at No.47 it was not overbearing as it was 2.58 metres from the boundary and at No.20 a metre was left from the boundary on the footpath side.

2. The finished height of the extension and garage would also be over-enclosing to the rear of our property as it would be in excess of 3000mm x 1830mm right up to the boundary.

3. When the planning department has dealt with other applications for extensions in Clive Avenue the subsequent reports have referred favourably to the distance from the proposed development to the neighbour's boundary i.e. No.47, No.25, No.20 (see point 1 above). None have been allowed to build right up to the boundary.

4. As per the planning guidelines, space from the boundary should be left for maintenance and to avoid encroachment of gutters and foundations. The proposal to build the foundations of the extension right up to the foundations of our garage is not acceptable.

5. We feel strongly that the utility room extension would detrimentally affect our property, both visually as it is too close, directly to the boundary and therefore overbearing, over-imposing and over-enclosing effect on our rear living room and by increased resonance and should not therefore be allowed. We believe there would be loss of light.

6. A condition (such as at No.25 and No.47) should be that no windows are put into the south facing aspect of the extension.

To reiterate we feel the height of our jointly owned garage wall should not be raised and converted to habitable room for all the reasons above.

The detached nature of the bungalows and adjoining garages should be retained to preserve the street scene.

It is important that the proposals at No.35 do not set a precedent so that other properties of Clive Avenue are not adversely affected.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Mr P & Mrs K Pescod