Gmail by Google

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0452/19

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 7 April 2019 at 20:19
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 8:23 PM on 07 Apr 2019 from Mr Shane Willard.

Application Summary

Address: 78 Harbour Way Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HH

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and rear extension and construction of two-storey pitched roof side extension and single-storey rear extension.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Shane Willard

Email: [redacted]

Address: 80 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5HH

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Other
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: Dear Hannah Barker,

RE: Planning Application AWDM/0452/19

We are writing to strongly object to the above planning application for a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. We are the owners of 80 Harbour Way, which is immediately adjacent to the proposed development at 78 Harbour Way. We have viewed the plans and we believe these will have a serious impact on both our property and the street scene. We also understand that they contravene Adur District Council's Development Management Policy with regards to extensions and alterations to dwellings. Our specific objections are as follows:

1. Appearance and Design

Development Management Standard No. 2: Side extensions 3.7. Side extensions should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. This is particularly important in the case of two story extensions since, if adjacent dwellings were both extended up to the boundary, it would create a "terracing" effect which

would destroy the existing character of the area.

Whilst Harbour Way has a variety of different types of housing, the section that we live on which runs from Winterton Way to The Burrells consists predominantly of semi-detached properties, ours being one of them. These semi-detached properties are clearly defined by a substantial gap between each set of two houses and this also sets them apart from the block of terraced housing at either end of this section of Harbour Way. Number 78 is part of one of these terraced blocks and is an end of terrace property. The proposed development would therefore create a substantial terracing effect from number 24 through to 82 which would be detrimental to the street scene and the character of Harbour Way. It would change the outlook of our property from semi-detached to terraced style where the development would come so close to the boundary. The plans have allowed no recess to the first level to avoid the terracing effect. Previous extensions at both 80 and 82 Harbour Way have had to recess in from the boundary.

2. Loss of privacy, overlooking and light

Development Management Standard No. 2: Side extensions 3.8. 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.

Development Management Standard No. 2: Standards for Extensions and Alterations 3.2. The closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property, by way of overlooking or loss of daylight.

Currently there is a recess of 560mm from the front of the house at 78 Harbour Way to the front of the existing garage as this is set back from the property. The plans for the proposed development show that the side extension will be pulled forward with the recess decreasing to 300mm. Due to this and the fact that it will be built up into a double side extension we believe it will directly impact the natural light to the rooms at the side of our property.

There is also a window shown in the plans in the master bedroom which overlooks number 76. Whilst we appreciate this won't directly impact us it indicates that there could also be issues for other neighbours.

3. Overhang of boundary

Our deeds for number 80 show a straight line for the boundary line which runs between number 78 and 80.This has been discussed with our neighbours at number 78 and both parties have agreed that the boundary is from the centre of the front wall between the properties to the centre of the back wall. The site map submitted with the application is incorrect as it's not a straight boundary line. The boundary wall

tapers and the distance between the two properties gets closer at the front of the houses. The plan shows a width of 2.6m from the edge of number 78 to the boundary wall and has not taken into account the overhang of roof, soffits and guttering of 300mm. This would bring the total width to 2.9m which would overhang into the boundary and therefore our property as the distance to the boundary wall is 2.84m.

We would be grateful if the council could take our objections into consideration when making a decision on this application. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our home to illustrate our objections at first hand.

Yours sincerely,

Shane & Leanne Willard

80 Harbour Way