Tracey Consterdine

From: Madame Clare Pears [redacted]
Sent: 20 November 2011 22:46
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on retrospective planning consent reference AWDM/0875/11

Attachments: planning response.doc



planning
sponse.doc (28 K

Peter Barnett

I have attacehed our response to the retrospective planning application reference AWDM/0875/11

Kind regards

A.E.Pears

Mr & Mrs A E Pears
9 The Avenue
Shoreham-by-Sea
Sussex
BN43 5GJ

15th November 2011

Dear Sirs

Re: Retrospective Planning Application ADC/0329/10 for 7 The Avenue, Shoreham-by-Sea

We wish to object to the retrospective alteration to the above property in the strongest possible terms.

We have viewed the new retrospective drawings which we consider to be most misleading.

The grounds for our objections are:

- Two roof windows have been installed on the east roof elevation instead of the original single one agreed.
  These two new roof windows contravene the original Conditions number 03, that all windows on the eastern side were to be glazed with obscured glass and to be fixed permanently non-openable
  Reason – to prevent overlooking and to comply with policy AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan.

- The position of the large fixed window in the upper storey wall has been moved towards the front of the house, this brings it closer in a direct line opposite our upper side bedroom window. This will cause light pollution to (9's) our western side elevation whenever the light on the stairs is switched on. This window has not been installed or glazed at the time of writing this letter.
  Reason – to prevent overlooking and to comply with policy AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan

- Three roof windows on the front slopping elevation over the ground floor have been added. These will cause light pollution to number 9

- A patio has been added to the front of the property. This will cause noise and light pollution when the patio is in use of an evening.
  With the building of this addition we are concerned about the loss of rain water to the established hedge on our boundary. (*as the prevailing rain comes across this concrete structure)* We also would like to know what has happened to the root system of same during the excavation for the foundations for this patio.

- The rear patio doors on the original plans 4A were 3.9 metres wide and were passed, but from day one when building commenced they were built 5.4 metres wide. When was planning permission passed for these wider doors? With doors this size it allows more light pollution to escape illuminating our rear garden

We do find that a lot of the things put in this retrospective planning application were originally in the first application and were rejected.

We trust you will take our objections into account when considering this retrospective planning application by Mr. Westlake of 7 The Avenue Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5GJ

This makes a mockery of the planning application process by increasing planning departments' costs at a time of budgetary tightness.

Kind regards

A.E. Pears