ASHENDEN - BAX

CHARTERED ARCHITECT

CALCETTO COTTAGE
CROSSBUSH LANE
ARUNDEL
WEST SUSSEX BN18 9PQ

Tel: 01903 882988
Email: ashendenbax@btinternet.com

28th February 2011

For the attention of Peter Barnett
Principal Planning Officer
Developmment Manager
Adur District Council
Portland House
Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex BN11 1LF

ADUR D.C.
CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S
DEPARTMENT
- 2 MAR 2011

Dear Mr Barnett

24 Cheal Close, Shoreham
Application no. ADC/0054/11

With reference to your email dated 24th February 2011 I have visited the site today and have the following answers to your queries :

- The roof is 250mm higher than the approved plan.
- The floor is 150mm higher than the approved plan. The reason for this is when the owners dismantled the existing extension they found that the existing foundation and floor slab was a steel reinforced raft and the building control officer was satisfied that this construction was suitable to be used for the majority of the new extension. However the original slab did not have any floor insulation and as this is a requirement for the new extension 75mm of floor insulation and 75mm of floor screed was added to the existing floor slab and the new extended raft foundation continued at the same levels. I can understand the owners reason for retaining the original raft foundation as to have broken out the steel reinforced raft foundation and taken the debris to land fill and then reconstruct the same raft foundation but 150mm lower would make very little practical or economic sense. I attach a plan with the area of the original raft foundation that was retained shown coloured. The previous floor level did not comply with current building regulation requirements as finished ground level was only 50mm above the internal floor level and damp proof course level.
- I attach a copy of the revised drawing 10.1552.11A as submitted with the current planning application on which I have marked the relevant existing heights, approved

heights and as built heights. Also I have included some existing external ground levels, which levels have been retained.

In addition to the above I have the following observations :

- When standing in the new extension it is not possible to see into the windows of the no 60 Riverside Road as the rear garden fence blocks out that view and the only window in the new extension is a tall narrow window.

- The orientation of the extension has not changed and this remains with its principal outlook to the west.

- The minimal additional height of the extension will not affect the quality of light reaching the rear windows of no 60 Riverside Road.

- Whilst views from a property are not a planning issue, there were no views from no 60 Riverside Road prior to the current extension being erected.

- The height of the previous extension was 2625mm which is 100mm higher than the approved extension and only 150mm lower than the extension as built.

- The garden to the rear of the application is raised and the applicants understand that this was done by previous owners in about 1976. Part of this raised area has been reduced in height to provide access around the rear of the new extension.

- I also attach a drawing no 10.1552.20 at a scale of 1:100 which shows a section between 24 Cheal Close and 60 Riverside Road. This section shows the approximate loss of light/view from a standing position in 60 Riverside Road. **This shows that the loss of light due to the increased height of the extension is approximately 0.8 degrees** and that the total blocking effect of the extension to natural light in a spectrum of the southern aspect is 2.22 degrees. A 2.22 degree loss is no where near the lowest angle of the sun at the winter solstice.

In conclusion, based on the information that I have provided above, it is my opinion that the additional height of the extension as built, being 250mm, has no material impact on the property to the north of the application site.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Maurice Ashenden-Bax