Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1048/19

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

15 July 2019 at 15:49

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

Comments were submitted at 3:56 PM on 15 Jul 2019 from Mr David Funnell.

Application Summary

Address: 2 Cypress Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6AE

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage. Remodelling of existing dwelling by raising ridge line and providing habitable accommodation at first floor level including 3 no. pitched roof dormers to west elevation. Two storey extension to north elevation with south facing pitched roof Juliet balcony. Single storey extensions to east and west elevations including new garage. New roof lights to all elevations (19 in total).

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Funnell

Email: [redacted]

Address: 13 Cypress Close, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6AE

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment

Comments: The proposed new building is an over-development of the site, the 2 storey rebuilt property changes the existing one story building of 6 rooms to a two story building with 13 rooms plus integral garage. Both the height and size of the proposed rebuild is not in keeping with the immediate surrounding properties and the Close in general and will be completely dominate the neighbouring properties and the other properties in the close.

The application states falsely the development does not require materials. There is insufficient information on the type and appearance of the materials employed in the rebuild. Adur policy states "the most important 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. " The proposal breaks these principles particularly the size of the new building.

It is not clear from the plans if it complies with the develop management standard (3.19) that a 6m

[redacted]

length is in front of a garage so that a car waiting to enter will not obstruct the highway neither does the plan clarify if there is a hard standing area for vehicles.

It would be reasonable to assume that as the new development has 5 bedrooms, more than one vehicle will be at the property at any one time making a single garage insufficient, further vehicles would therefore be parked on the street and as the property is at the end of the Close it is likely that these vehicles would restrict/negate the turning space. Council refuse vehicles need the space to turn, as would an emergency vehicle and the majority of residents' cars entering the close.

The central green is a haven for the local children where they can and do play in relative safety, recent experience shows that the limited access/ turning points for trade vehicles results in vehicles being parked or driven across the green and a development of this size and duration would create considerable risk to the children playing on the green.

[redacted]