planning application AWDM/0491/18 (9 Queens Place, Shoreham-by-Sea)

1 message

Michelle Martindale [redacted] 15 May 2018 at 16:03
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

FOR THE ATTENTION OF PETER BARNETT (AND GARY PECK)

11 Queens Place

Shoreham-by-Sea

West Sussex BN43 5AA

15 May 2018.

Peter Barnett
Development Management
Adur and Worthing Council
Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex BN11 1HS.

Your reference: AWDM/0491/18 (re 9 Queens Place, Shoreham-by-Sea)

Dear Mr Barnett,

I am a resident of Queens Place, Shoreham-by-Sea, and am the householder and owner of number 11 in that street.

I am writing to register the strongest possible objections to the proposal that yet another aggressive and inappropriate dormer roof extension be constructed in Queens Place.

I have great reason to be concerned and infuriated by such a proposal, and am personally very well informed about the impact of such developments, having closely observed the creeping destructiveness as a number of such roof extensions have appeared along this street in the past few years,
and, in particular, having suffered the impact of yet another one built very recently next door to me, at number 12.

All of these structures are intolerably out of keeping with the shape and design of these small Victorian terraced homes. The houses of Queens Place are relatively narrow and not especially tall. The placing of such large and looming dormers on their roofs radically disrupts their design. Historically,
dormer windows might have sat reasonably comfortably on such roofs, provided they were of traditional style and dimensions, and constituted only a small part of the whole roof area. The horror of the structures that I am objecting to is that they take over virtually the entirety of the roofs concerned,
thereby fundamentally changing the shape of the buildings, and presenting aggressive angles and top-heavy weighting of the roof-line, as well as far too much dark colouring against the line of sight. It is not surprising that some of my neighbours have abandoned the innocuous term 'dormer', and tend to refer to such structures as 'sheds/shacks on the roof'.

I am aware that the Planning Office reveres, as something of nearly scriptural authority, the principle that precedents set within a street, particularly within closely adjacent parts of that street, carry more weight than any other considerations. Thus, if roof extensions with large dormers have been allowed

on numbers 7, 8 and 12, then number 9 is fair game. I wish to contest the validity of this purely arbitrary principle, which suggests, in effect, that once some damage has been done, with whatever quality of justification, you might as well give up and do, or permit, a whole lot more of the same. In opposition to this, I wish to contend that the so-called precedent, which is, of course, so easy to specify and apply, cannot justify further encroachments. The more disruptions to the roof-lines of individual houses, the more destructive it is to the character of the whole terrace. More of these structures means, progressively, more blocking of light around these homes.

And , make no mistake, there is a detrimental impact on the amount of light available to neighbouring residents. I deeply resent being told, by official sources, as I have been told, that because the new structure on number 12 has a flat roof no higher than the ridge-line of the original roof, therefore it cannot block any light. I know what it looks like from the back of my house. The angle of sight from ground level makes the dormer/shed appear to rise well above the ridge-line of the roof, and the amount of sunlight able to reach the back of my property during the course of a day has been considerably reduced.

It is also very evident that that the placing of the structures in question allows a much greater overview of the back areas of nearby properties, not only those immediately adjacent, and that, in consequence, the degree privacy that residents previously enjoyed has been appreciably diminished.

I ask that the criteria of light and privacy, as well as that of design and appearance, be taken into account in your assessment at least as seriously as the narrow criterion of precedent, which I know you value so much.

Yours sincerely,

Michelle Martindale (Mrs).