Fwd: Planning Objection AWDM/1180/20

1 message

Carol Pople [redacted] 13 August 2020 at 14:58
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

I understand that my objection to the second planning application for 22 Mill Hill, Shoreham has not been logged as I my previous objection AWDM/0812/20 has not been cross referenced. Re the latest application AWDM/1180/20 I strongly object As follows:

Carol Pople contact tel: [redacted]

5 Mill Hill, Shoreham by sea BN43 5TG

Planning Objection

Re: Planning Application AWDM/1180/20

Ground floor rear extension, Juliet balcony to east elevation, covered way to south. (Porch and entrance to north side and south and north side dormer windows to be constructed under permitted development.)

22 Mill Hill Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TH

I note that the amended plans show the dormers covering both sides of the roof and the porch to the north are to be constructed under permitted development.

In addition to my previous objections to AWDM/0812/20, please can you consider the following:

From my house opposite the change to the planning application makes no difference to the appearance of the extremely large dormer which will disproportionately affect the appearance of the property. Additional roof space has already been added to the chalet bungalow at 22 Mill Hill on three previous occasions.

In 1990 on application SU/219/90/TP/6628, Two Storey Rear Extension

In 1996 on application SU/43/96/TP/16307, Dormer to Roof Slope on South Side

In 2006 on application SU/10/06/TP/22337. Ground Floor Rear Extension and Attached Conservatory

The two storey rear extension had a substantial addition to the roof and also the ground floor rear extension has a pitched roof.

The maximum volume of additional roof space allowed for permitted development is 50 cubic metres. Please can you ensure that the previous additional roof is included in the volume allowance as it appears to have already been exceeded.

The proposed dormers, as I have stated, would dominate the roof and appear bulky and out of proportion with the original chalet bungalow. This will have a devastating effect on the appearance of the bungalow as viewed from my house and the road and adversely impact the neighbours at No20 and No24 Mill Hill.

It will also be out of character with other properties in Mill Hill.

The large porch and entrance to the north side is still extremely close to the adjoining neighbours boundary and will cause a terracing affect as viewed from the road.

The porch and entrance should be moved well away from the boundary to lessen this affect.

Please can you ensure the porch and entrance meets the maximum permitted size of 3 square metres.

I have also noticed that another ground floor extension has been added to the existing extension at the rear of No22. The combined extensions would cover an area of 8.37 metres by 8.9 metres.

This shows as being very large and bulky for the intended purpose of a kitchen/dining/living room.

I would not like this size of rear extension to become the norm in Mill Hill and consider that the proposed extension should be reduced in size and moved well away from the boundary to limit the impact on

neighbouring properties.

I maintain that the new proposal is still of poor design and has paid limited regard to its surroundings.

Further, I would ask of the local councillors that if this application is approved the matter be put before the planning committee for further consideration.

Carol Pople