Mr & Mrs A V Wall
342 Upper Shoreham Road
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex BN43 5QE

[redacted]

29 February 2020
Re: AWDM/1653/19

ADUR & WORTHING
- 3 MAR 2020
PLANNING SERVICES

Dear Eve Hearsey.

Proposed single-story extention to the East side of 344 Upper Shoeham Road

With regards to planning proposal AWDM/1653/19 we wish to state our objections and comments.

Firstly, we would have no objection to the existing garage structure being rebuilt to form habitable space. However, our major concerns with the plans are as follows.

1: The wall of the new structure will be at least 3m high. The distance from our property is approximately 1.1m at the existing building and will taper to 1.0m. At the most Southerly point it will be just 0.5m. We believe the structure would be too close to the front of the houses and undoubtably, (when viewed from the road), give the appearance of the properties being joined. Not a valid point under today's planning rules but certainly an architectural issue.

2: There are existing windows to the West side of our property which will face the proposed extention. They both serve habitable rooms.
Firstly, our kitchen/breakfast room will most certainly be affected. We understand that planning departments use a 45/25 degree rule to help them make judgment in cases such as this. If applied it would most certainly not comply in both horizontal and vertical aspects.
The second window is in the living room and although relatively small, spreads light to the back of the room. We believe the degree rule would apply here too.

We have lived at this property since 1991 and understand that after that period of time there is a rule that guarantees us the right to light from such windows.

3: Although not planning issues we would like to draw attention to the very close proximity of gas and water facilities on our property but perhaps more importantly, the foul water manhole and pipe work which are situated only centimetres from the proposed construction. There is a manhole giving access to the main sewer running behind all properties, positioned exactly on the north corner of the garage. The sewer pipe at that point is about a metre deep.
There is also a sewer pipe running diagonally under the current garage floor.

In conclusion we strongly object to the submitted plans. We think the architect person responsible has taken little or no account of the impact the structure would have on the neighbouring property.
We fail to understand why the idea of extending to the side of the property has been chosen, with all the disruption,distress and loss of light it will cause, instead of opting for a rear extention as others have done. The existing garage could then be retained.

Yours Faithfully
Mr & Mrs Anthony Wall

[redacted]