Planning application for 81 Hammy Way

1 message

[redacted] 4 June 2021 at 16:03

To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Sally and Richard Harvey Date 3rd June 2021

51 Hammy Way

Shoreham by Sea Bn43 6GH

Planning department Adur and Worthing Council

Re; 81 Hammy Way – Your Ref; AWDM/0892/21

Dear Mary O'Keeffe

I have considered the plans that I have seen and wish to reply upon the matter of the pending

Planning Application lodged by our neighbours.

My husband Ricky and I are both of the opinion while it is not always possible to be in a financial position to move from an existing home to a larger property and that an alternative may be an extension/enlargement of the current home, but we feel we must object to the proposed application for the following reasons;.

1. Such alterations would be completely out of character with the other properties in the area
2. We believe that most of the dwellings were originally designed as Bungalows with possibly two bedrooms only (as depicted in the drawings for No. 81), but any alterations to other properties do not appear to go above the existing roofline as is the case with No,81.
3. The side elevation facing south on the drawing 02.REV. A No 10 shows an increased height in the roofline of No.81 by approximately of 7 depth of roof tiles.
4. The general view of the proposed changes gives the very substantial impression of a very large box type of roof extension, quite literately "dumped" on the existing roof structure of No,81 and may create a very bad impression when approaching the close and spoil the look of the environment
5. Such an alteration may also have a detrimental effect on the sale ability of our property
6. . The proposed alterations indicate an increase in the floor areas of No. 81 by about 90 per percent and we feel that this must constitute "overdevelopment" in a very limited size residential area and could set a very dangerous precedent for future planning applications in our close

As I have already mentioned above we must object to the proposed application and urge the Planning Officer responsible and the Planning Committee Members to reject the application.

Many thanks

Sally Harvey

[redacted]