From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 01 January 2024 20:16
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1321/23

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/01/2024 8:16 PM from Ms Jane Langley.

Application Summary

Address:	15 Wallace Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN11 5RA
Proposal:	AMENDED DESCRIPTION: Alterations to roof of existing rear extension to include replacement roof tiles and construction of a parapet to side (south) wall.
Case Officer:	Rebekah Hincke

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Jane Langley
Address:	13 Wallace Avenue, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 5RA

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	13 Wallace Avenue Worthing BN11 5RA 28 December 2023 To Whom it May Concern RE: OBJECTION TO APPLICATION AWDM/1321/23 PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS 5 DECEMBER 2023

This objection to the AWDM/1321/23 Proposed Plans & Elevations submitted on 5 December 2023 in response to the amended latest plan A.101A submitted on 05/12/2023.

No.15 and No.13 red bricked semi-detached 1939 properties are situated on the corner of Latimer Road and Wallace Avenue - effectively the entrance and exit viewpoints for the proposed conservation area of Marine Gardens that includes the three large Art Deco red brick residential blocks of flats around the perimeter. The block on Romney Road is adjacent to the red brick house on the corner of Romney Road and Wallace Avenue, this faces directly onto No.15 and No.13. The proposed conservation area is currently being considered as a tight area as the surrounding houses do not have intact period fenestration. The houses, however, viewed from the street have intact period elevations, this includes No.13. However, No.15's rear extension is visible from the street.

The extension is not fully built in red brick and the current design is only in keeping with the expedient prior permission as part of permitted development. However, the extension was not built to the dimensions required by permitted development, the actual building is higher and wider than permitted and significantly different to the scale architectural drawings submitted in the planning application. Therefore, this objection is to the amended plan to be considered in addition to the previous objections to the initial plan as none are a true record of the actual extension.

The Side Elevation of the amended plan does not state the materials of the wall as it exists now or as to what proposed materials will be used to heighten the wall to a parapet. The current wall is breeze block, the Side Elevation is shown as being uniform, this plan is grossly inadequate. Without specification of materials of a wall adjoining an intact Art Deco era original red brick the impact of a heightened wall cannot be judged regardless of its actual dimensions and actual position.

The Side Elevation of the amended plan does not show the proximity of the actual wall nor is it presented in context with regards to its actual construction beyond the party wall with No.13. The impact of the current extension is that light previously entering No.13 has been limited detrimentally by the actual proximity as opposed to if the extension had actually been built to the dimensions of permitted development and/or of the plans submitted. By increasing the height into a parapet this problem will be exacerbated greatly.

The Rear Elevation of the amended plan illustrates what the extension would present to the street. The actual extension is more visible to the street as it is larger and higher than the scale architectural drawing presents. Being a more prominent construction it is more notable as a design not in keeping with any of the surrounding intact elevations and not aligned with the heritage of the era of the original main building. Adding a parapet would create a design more in keeping with a Victorian terrace outbuilding/lean-to rather than as a tribute or sympathetic addition to the original building. An alteration in design should not be considered when an alteration is needed to resolve sub standard building and not building to specifications in the first place. There should not be a permanent feature captured in design for this purpose.

Construction of a parapet in itself creates an overbearing wall. Creating an overbearing wall within such close proximity to the adjacent property amplifies the impact considerably. Whether the impact is light loss, non matching materials, overbearing in outlook or incongruent in design, the true impact cannot be truly estimated based on the misleading scale architectural plans submitted. Considering especially that the context of the actual extension and the true scale of the parapet is not presented for consideration, planning permission should not be allowed. It is not close to an appropriate design for the house, the era or locale.

Kind regards