Comments: Householder Planning Application AWDM/1516/21

1 message

Tommy Cairns <[redacted]> 5 September 2021 at 07:57
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Cc: "[redacted]"

Hello,

I was asked to send comments by and on behalf of Mr and Mrs S Whitchurch of 2 Adur Road, BN43 5NP. They are neighbours of the proposed plans for 1 Adur Road. They've been submitted online but were slightly truncated (by just a few words) due to the text limit so I've copied the associated comments below, and Mr and Mrs Whitchurch are copied in should you have any queries.

Many thanks.

"We are writing to you with regard to the recent Homeowner Planning Application submitted for 1 Adur Road, BN43 5NP (Ref: PP-10117401). Whilst we have no objections at all in principle to extension and refurbishment works to the adjoining, neighbour's property, we do have significant reservations about the current proposals, which include inaccuracies within the drawings themselves. Although we consider the footprint and general scope to be reasonable, our concerns relate to the overall massing, impact on local amenity/the immediate street scene, and how the plans sit alongside Adur District Council's supplementary planning guidance (Development Management Standard No.2).

The are a number of references with the DMS that we feel are relevant, the most notable of which are:

2.1. Planning Principles: In considering an application for an extension to a house or bungalow one of the main planning concerns is to ensure that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties.

2.5. Appearance: The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally.

3.8. Side Extensions: The extension should usually be set back slightly from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling and to avoid difficulty in matching wall and roof materials. Very wide side extensions should normally be avoided since they would usually be out of scale with the existing dwelling and spoil its proportions.

3.11. Dormers and Roof Extensions: Rear dormers and other roof alterations like hip-to-gable extensions may be able to be carried out as permitted development. Where permission is required, they should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy "box-like" appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house.

3.14. Dormers and Roof Extensions: Where permission is required, roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings. In some instances, the enlargement of a hipped roof into a gable or half-gable end may respect the proportions of a property more than adding dormers. However, the acceptability of the resulting lack of symmetry would depend on the visual quality and character of the area……. The cumulative effect of a combined roof extension and dormers is unlikely to be acceptable since the resulting works would probably be out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling.

With regard to the submitted plans, we don't feel that the existing and proposed front facing elevations provide a fair reflection of the local topography. The gradient running North to South along Adur Road is significant and doesn't appear to have been accounted for in the drawings. The gradient will influence the massing of the proposal, its appearance from the public highway, and its scale alongside both neighbouring properties. We're unsure that 'Bryon' (the house located directly South of 1 Adur Road) would be sat on the same datum level as is shown in the East elevations.

There appears to be some inconsistency with the CAD drawings. On the proposed roof plan, section A-A bisects the space between two of the dormers. On the sectional drawing, transect A-A itself seems to run through the central dormer. The proposed sectional drawing also shows the front faces of the dormers resting on the structural front wall (East elevation) whereas in drawings elsewhere they sit in and away from the main front elevation. The extent of the East facing pitched roofs to 1 and 2 Adur Road on the existing and proposed roof plans appear to be inconsistent (RE finishing position over the adjoining bays). We also believe that the location and block plans omit additional garden space belonging to 1 Adur Road that was previously within the curtilage of 33 Adur Avenue. These queries are mostly for peace of mind—we would like to ensure that what we are presented with is a true representation of the actual design intent.

Whilst a hip-to-gable roof extension with a clipped peak over the current footprint would be consistent, the extended floor area with a full hip-to-gable roof and without any subservient detailing or stepping to either the roofline or front elevation, would be out of character and contrary to the DMS guidance, and create two distinctly different but adjoining properties.

In isolation, the front facing dormers wouldn't be unappealing but, in the context of the local street scene, they appear to be voluminous and out of keeping. Overall we consider the appearance, scale and character of the original semi-detached dwellings front and side elevations would be unrecognisable.

We do welcome in principle the owners endeavours to modernise and extend, and respect their rights to do so, but we feel strongly that the submitted plans are contrary to Adur District Council's supplementary planning guidance and will adversely impact on both neighbouring dwellings, and the wider street scene."

THREE%

Interior & Exterior Environments
Visual Design and Development

113 South Street, Tarring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 7ND

[redacted]