Email: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Ms Hannah Barker
Mr Gary Peck

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

11th August 2020

Dear Ms Barker

Re: Planning application AWDM/1180/20 (application AWDM/0812/20 amended)
Ground floor rear extension, Juliet balcony to east elevation, covered way to south. (Porch and verandah 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

Please consider our objections when making decisions regarding the application for construction under Permitted Development and the Amended Planning Application.

Our Objection to the request for Permitted Development:

The roof space of this Chalet Bungalow has been increased from its original build by the previous planning approvals ref SU/219/90/6628, SU/43/96/TP/16307 and SU/10/06/TP/22337, therefore there is little to no remaining volume to build dormers to the north and south sides within the allowable maximum of 50 cu metres under Permitted Development. Please can you ensure the previous roof developments are taken into account.
The front dormer to the south side, as shown on the plans, appears to overlook a bedroom of No. 20, which should not be allowed.
The proposed dormers would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the current dwelling and a significant effect on properties opposite and the public views from the road. We are not aware of any other similar construction in Mill Hill where there are very large dormers to both sides of a property, as seen from the road.

On the north side the Plans show an extension to the main dwelling as an Entrance Hall with a Porch area attached. Both individually exceed the 3 square metres allowable under permitted development. The proximity of the proposed constructions right to the boundary should not be allowed as any excavation for footings could compromise the foundations of no. 24.
Also, any construction to the north side should be positioned well away from the boundary to avoid the appearance of overdevelopment with a cramped and terracing effect.

We believe any further building development of No. 22 should only be allowed under Planning Application approval.

Our objections to the Amended Planning Application:

The considerable ground floor extension to the south side would have an overbearing and oppressive impact on No. 20, due to its size and proximity to the boundary. We suggest a minimum of 4 metres from the boundary between Nos. 22 and 20 should be stipulated to reduce the oppressive impact.

The proposed Juliet Balcony would deprive us of privacy to our rear garden and especially to our patio area with table and chairs. We would have extreme concerns if the Juliet Balcony gave access to the proposed flat roof extension to the existing rear extension, as this would further impact on the privacy of the rear gardens and enable the rear windows of Nos.20 and 24 to be overlooked.

We respectfully request that this amended application is refused.

Yours sincerely

M.A. and P.I Wilson
24 Mill Hill