From: **samantha matthews**
Date: Sun, 30 Nov 2025 at 22:27
Subject: Application AWDM/1333/25 - 43 Parham Road - Response to Objections
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>, maria.okeeffe@adur-worthing.gov.uk <maria.okeeffe@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

43 Parham Road,
Worthing,
West Sussex, BN14 0BN

30th November 2025

Development Management, Place Directorate,
Adur & Worthing Councils,
Worthing Town Hall,
Chapel Road, Worthing,
West Sussex, BN11 1HA

Dear Maria O'Keeffe

RE: Planning Application AWDM/1333/25 - Response to Third Party Objections

I am writing in response to the objections submitted by neighboring properties at 41 and 45 Parham Road regarding the above planning application for a rear extension at 43 Parham Road.
I would like to address the concerns raised and provide clarification on several points that appear to be based on misunderstandings of both the proposal and relevant planning policy.

1. Correction of Policy Reference
The objection from 45 Parham Road makes repeated reference to Policy DM17 of the Worthing Local Plan, claiming the proposal conflicts with residential amenity protections. However, Policy DM17 in Adur & Worthing Councils relates to energy efficiency requirements for new developments, not residential amenity or design considerations.
The concerns raised by the objectors would more appropriately fall under policies relating to residential extensions and amenity protection. I would respectfully request that the planning officer assesses this application against the correct and relevant planning policies for residential extensions in Worthing.

2. Clarification on Juliet Balconies
Both objections refer extensively to concerns about overlooking from "balconies." I wish to clarify that the proposed features are Juliet balconies, not projecting balconies. Juliet balconies are non-projecting safety railings fitted flush to the building facade in front of French doors. They do not create a platform that can be stepped onto or stood upon.
The level of overlooking from a Juliet balcony is identical to that of any standard first-floor rear-facing window. These are common features in residential properties and

do not create any additional overlooking beyond what would occur from a conventional window at the same location.

3. Rear-Facing Windows and Separation Distances
The proposed first-floor windows are rear-facing, looking directly down our own garden. This is the standard orientation for first-floor windows in residential extensions and is consistent with normal residential development patterns.
The proposal maintains appropriate separation distances to neighboring properties and boundaries in accordance with standard planning guidance for residential amenity.

4. Loss of Light
The objection from 41 Parham Road mentions loss of natural light. However, our proposed extension is to the rear of our property, while both objecting properties are located to our sides. The extension does not project significantly beyond the rear building line and is proportionate to our property.
Given the orientation and position of the extension, it is very unlikely to cause any material loss of light to either neighboring property.

5. Design and Character
The objection from 45 Parham Road suggests the extension is out of character and larger than other extensions in the area. However, each planning application must be assessed on its own merits in relation to the specific property. Our extension is proportionate to our house, does not breach the building line excessively, and follows a design that is common for rear extensions in residential areas.

6. Willingness to Address Concerns
While I believe the objections are not supported by planning policy, I am willing to consider reasonable mitigation measures. If the planning officer considers it appropriate, I would be open to discussing the installation of obscure glazing on any windows that directly face the side boundaries (as opposed to those facing directly to the rear). This would address privacy concerns while still allowing natural light into the property.

Conclusion
I respectfully submit that the objections raised are based on a misunderstanding of the proposal (particularly regarding Juliet balconies), cite incorrect planning policy, and do not identify any material breach of relevant planning guidance.
The proposed extension is modest in scale, appropriate to the property, and complies with relevant planning policies regarding residential extensions and residential amenity.
I would be grateful if the planning officer could assess this application objectively against the correct planning policies and design guidance for residential extensions in Worthing.
Should you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Yours faithfully,
Samantha Matthews and Simon Jefferies

43 Parham road , Worthing, BN14 0BN