Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0577/21

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 25 April 2021 at 21:22
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/04/2021 9:23 PM from Mr Richard Pelham.

Application Summary

Address: 5 Mill Hill Drive Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TJ

Proposal: Amendment to previously approved AWDM/0694/20 (Conversion of roof space with front and rear dormers, raising of the roof ridge, front facing rooflights and single storey rear extension) to form a mono-pitched roof over both the new and the existing extensions.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Richard Pelham

Address: 3 Mill Hill Drive, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5TJ

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: Dear Hannah Barker,

I am the direct neighbour to the applicant at 3 Mill Hill Drive. I would like to object to this application due to loss of light. I did not object to the main application as there would be only minor detriment on loss of light by raising the ridge and adding dormers but the amendment causes greater concern with significant detriment.

I am objecting to the mono-pitched roof to the existing extension that is directly opposite our kitchen window. On measuring from the "Proposed Block Plan" Drg. No. 2047-PL-150 (B) submitted with the application the distance from the existing extension to our kitchen window at 3 Mill Hill Drive is 3.68 metres. The existing extension height as shown on "Existing Elevations" Drg.No. 2047-PL-301 submitted with the application is 2.4 metres on the west elevation. Scaling from the plan, the flat roof height is 2.5 metres. The proposed mono-pitch max height as shown on "Proposed Elevations to Rear Ground Floor Extensions" Drg. No. 2047-PL-350 submitted with this application is scaled as 3.7 metres.

In measuring the existing and proposed obstruction angle using the Building Research Establishment (BRE) document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice (2011)'; a 25

degree test has been carried out. The centre of the window height of our kitchen is 1.7 metres from ground level and the existing obstruction angle would be (2.5-1.7)/3.68 = 21 degrees. The proposed obstruction angle at the highest point of the mono-pitch would be (3.7-1.7)/3.68 = 54 degrees. An obstruction angle of below 25 degrees would give satisfactory daylight and sunlight results. An obstruction angle of 25-45 degrees; special measures are required (enlarged windows, changes to room layout) are usually needed to provide adequate daylight. An obstruction angle of 45-65 degrees, it is very difficult to provide adequate daylight, unless very large. Therefore there would be inadequate daylight and sunlight through this window.

The kitchen is joined by a dining area that has additional windows but some 5 metres away and north facing, the area directly in front of the window is covered from light from the dining area by full height cupboards and is used for a greater length of time due to there being a sink. Light would also be further reduced from the rising of the ridge, reducing light in the south-east direction from the original application and should be taken account of.

The application should be refused as this does not meet the test in the BRE guidance and causes adverse impact to neighbours' home. Neighbouring properties have a right of light and there are a number of health impacts to be considered on not receiving enough daylight or sunlight. The objection is only to the mono-pitch to the existing extension and not to the new extension that includes sky lights. The pitch to the existing extension does not provide any additional amenity or light to the proposals and should be removed reducing any adverse impacts. The application is therefore in contrary to Adur and Worthing Development Management Policy 15 as has an unacceptable impact on daylight/sunlight on adjacent residential properties and should be refused.

Yours sincerely

Mr Richard Pelham

Kind regards