WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED 26 JUN 2012
On Comp. | In Report (D/C)
Addm. | Post Addm.

MRS. F. & MISS L. ALFREY
132 KINGS ROAD
LANCING
WEST SUSSEX
BN15 8DX

24th JUNE 2012

YOUR REFERENCE:
AWDM/0692/12

Dear Sirs,

Re: 134 KINGS ROAD, LANCING, BN15 8DX
OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION ON THIS PROPERTY
(SINGLE STOREY PITCHED ROOF REAR EXTENSION)

We are the owner/occupiers of the property 132 Kings Rd., Lancing - Mrs. Freda & Miss Lorraine Alfrey.

We recently received notification from yourselves of a planning application submitted by the neighbouring property 134 Kings Rd., Lancing.

We hereby put in writing our objections to the application on the grounds that the proposals would result in a significant loss of privacy and light; and that we feel we would be very much overlooked by the new extension.

We hereby ask the planning officers to consider our following comments and concerns:

1/ The proposed new extension is significantly wider than the existing extension (proposed 4.86m).
This means that the extension would be much closer to our bungalow and garden than at present and would be very much 'in our face' to use the colloquial saying!
This is not helped by the fact that the existing flat roof would be replaced by in our opinion, a very high pitched tiled roof, adding to the sense of 'invasion'.
The new extension would tower over us.

2/
The fact that the proposed increase of width would mean the property is closer and that the roof high pitched must inevitably lead to a loss of light entering not only our bungalow but our garden also — and as both are north-facing, are not exactly overdowed with sunlight as it is.

3/
Added to this, is that the proposed East elevation side, is to be of the floor to ceiling, full width, concertina, fold-back comptely type of doors - this is only going to exasperate the feeling of a loss of privacy -

We will feel totally overlooked; it will seem like our neighbours will be seated in our property/grounds - especially when the doors ~~are~~ are fully opened.
It would lead to our main bedroom feeling very exposed.

4/
What is not obvious from the submitted plans, is that 134 Kings Rd. is on slightly higher ground than ours and that in any case both the bungalows are on a higher level than the grounds of the rear gardens.
So this again would aggravate the fact that we would be overlooked by the East side concerting doors/opening, especially if the extension is to be so much nearer to our property than at present.

5/ &
Please note that section 10 (materials) is we believe to be incorrectly completed on 2 accounts
a/ Walls are stated to be existing as painted render - they are/appear to be currently stained/painted wood.
b/ Existing roof is not believed to be tiled but as of the flat roof type would

be of felt (recently roof has been covered with blue tarpaulin / waterproof sheeting).

Yours Faithfully,

L. ALFREY (MISS) [redacted]

F. ALFREY (MRS.) [redacted]