From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 24 August 2021 07:38
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1313/21

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 24/08/2021 7:37 AM from Ms Helena Hilfiker.

Application Summary

Address:	39 Kingston Lane Southwick Brighton West Sussex BN42 4SJ
Proposal:	Raising of the roof ridge and eaves to form rooms in roof with side (north) dormer and rooflight to both sides; single storey rear extension; first floor front extension over existing bay
Case Officer:	Marie O'Keeffe

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Helena Hilfiker
Address:	41 Kingston Lane, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex BN42 4SJ

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	PLANNING APPLICATIO AWDM/1313/21 In response to the complaint regarding the proposed works to :- 39 Kingston Lane, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex BN42 4SJ Firstly, the rear extension is only single storey and can be supported either through the Larger Homes planning application or a full house holders application as a 4m extension is not excessive. Several planning application have been granted in the street for this. No 41 had a single-storey extension to the boundary wall - permitted in 2016 for a 4.5 metre extension this is beyond our planned extended single storey of 4 metre which is predominately replacing the current kitchen and conservatory. The proposed rear extension is similar in

design to number 41 and number 43. The works to the loft is not a full storey height. The extent of the new ridge is 1.5m higher than the existing to reduce any impact on the neighbours as well as limiting the overall massing. An earlier conversation with planners suggested that a full two story building could be supported.

.....And the relevance is ??

LIGHT
The site is orientated East (rear garden) to a West (front) which means number 39 is cast in shadow by the complaintive dwelling. As the sun moves from East to west, I can not see how this development effects no 41 amenity or light. I would suggest a light survey be carried out if deemed necessary, but hopefully common sense will prevail. It is worth mentioning that the two open top hinged north facing windows to 41 are not the main windows to their room

Please tell me how the architect knows that the two open hinged north facing windows are not main windows ??

39 was designed and built to be a bungalow and to be 'so called ' cast in shadow was and never has been in issue in the last 26 years I have resided in 41, if this is the case why buy a house if you feel you live in a shadow by neighbouring buildings.

.....,We 100% support and insist a light survey to be carried out.

VIEWS
Views do not form part of any planning policy. The works to the roof still fall within the original building line and do not protrude past no 41 so its unclear how any loss of views or amenity can be lost.

.....The views are ruined by the height of the proposed building!!

PRIVACY
Most houses at first floor will have windows facing the rear gardens. If the scheme was a dormer built under permitted development, potential overlooking is inevitable. No 41 rear windows overlook their neighbours. The roof lights are 2.6m above the finished floor level so there can be no overlooking. It obscured glazing is required, then this can be added.

.....41/43 have been built since 1930, again this is irrelevant regarding overlooking windows.

NOISE
Noise does not form part of any planning policy. Acceptable working hours on site can be set. Was noise considered when extensive development works where

undertaken to both neighbouring properties? A persons career choice is again not a planning concern and should not affect the right for a home owner to extend their property.

.....Actually noise was considered and both neighbouring properties were consulted especially as the extension on 41/43 were built together by the same building company, 39 was involved massively with the owner and her family, so noise was never an issue but respected.

OTHER
The proposed does not include any development to the garage.

STREET SCENE
Currently, no 39 is dwarfed by the two howes either side. This proposal will give a better aesthetic to the street scene. The street already has an eclectic mix of dwellings and I don't support the argument that this will reduce house prices in the street.

Again the houses have been built since 1930, every one was happy with the design and at no point 39 was ever deemed 'dwarfed' not then but only now !!

.....As to aesthetic, opinion's are universal, everyone has one.

.....By having a building/brick wall directly outside 2 big windows will have a huge impact on potential property price, currently our house can be sold with views, with the proposed build the view will be a massive tall brick wall.

.....We would like to raise the question again regarding the scaffolding to the proposed build, this will be incredibly close to our boundary and the severe impact it would have on not being able to open windows for ventilation, noise, dust, privacy and most of all light being blocked out.

Kind regards