Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0685/16

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 14 June 2016 at 19:56
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 7:56 PM on 14 Jun 2016 from Ms stella filmer.

Application Summary

Address: 89 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HA

Proposal: Construction of single-storey outbuilding and associated landscaping.

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Ms stella filmer

Email: [redacted]

Address: 27 East Meadway, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5RF

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments: Objection to amended planning application – reference planning application: AWDM/0685/16
Since viewing the amended planning application I reiterate my objection. The size and the type of extended living space this amended planning application would create, directly on the border with neighbours, remains unchanged. But I will update my objections in line with the minor alterations indicated by the amended application. In the amended application the proposed building, West to East, is now shown as standing 100cm in, from the neighbour's fences (on the west and east of the applicant's rear garden boundary), rather than 60cm, as it was in the original submission (a grand reduction in overall length of 80cm). Please note that this reduction, small as it is, does not correspond to the amended size of the proposed building (which has only been reduced in length by 65cm). With this discrepancy in mind and to share again an overview of the overwhelming impact (on DIRECTLY affected neighbours) the proposed "Outbuilding" in this amended application consists of: - a room (2.22m by 3 m) with a window and no

exterior door. That's only a change of 40cm in width since the last design submission. - a wide hall (2.6m by 3m) with large sliding patio doors (connecting the building's two main living spaces). Which remains unchanged from the last design submission. - a very large room (now consolidated with the bathroom that featured in the last design plan) (6.73m by 3m) with 5 windows. At the most optimistic (taking into consideration the discrepancy above) that's only a change of 40cm in width since the last design submission. This proposed building is still far too large. It would be 34.65 metres squared (86.6 cubic metres). This proposed building represents additional and exterior living accommodation. It will have electricity, enabling lighting, heating and any electrical applications and any electrical equipment. In the original application, space was allotted for a bathroom suite (with toilet, sink and shower). This physical space remains available on the amended application (together with a high, bathroom style window). My point is, the removal in labelling only of a bathroom suite, has not been accompanied by any corresponding reduction in the size of the building. It only results in an even larger living area. In front of this proposed building, and along the entire 11.55m width, there is wooden decking, at the same level as the proposed building. This is shown as 3+m in length. The decking now comes further down the applicant's garden, taking up more than half of the garden space. The applicant refers to the trees and shrubs etc in number 29 and 27 East Meadway, as justification for this proposed large building being at such close proximity to our boundaries. I would point out that the survival of these mature trees, shrubs etc would be in severe jeopardy with the applicant's proposal. The proposed outbuilding would have 34.5 metres squared of foundation concrete, at very close proximity to the roots of the trees and shrubs referred to above. In contrast the applicant's proposal allows no space for the same growth of such pleasant and softening trees and shrubs. This amended proposal creates a new large exterior living space that: - is only 100cm (potentially less based on the discrepancy mention earlier) away from the rear, western and eastern boundaries of neighbouring properties - would stand over a metre above my boundary fence - runs along the ENTIRE width of the applicant's rear garden boundary (the property itself was developed on an original site plus an additional portion of land which has created a irregularly shaped back garden). Please note on drawing O4B, the diagram "proposed north facing elevation (from the other side of the boundary fence)" is misleading. The west four metres of the fence shown in this diagram is in fact situated seven metres south. - is proposed on a property that already has a condition against it (condition 7*) to control even permitted development rights. I believe this condition was placed for a good reason on this site and indicates the significant negative impact any such large, inappropriate outbuilding would have. Please note my garden is DIRECTLY next to this proposal. It would be less than 7m away from my home. It would have an overwhelming and a

directly negative effect on the amenities of my property – being an extra source of noise and removing the necessary amount of garden space between living accommodations. In short, this proposed building is too large, inappropriate, un-neighbourly and intrusive. It constitutes exterior living accommodation situated at very close proximity to the rear boundaries of neighbours. Stella Filmer 27 East Meadway, BN43 5RF Date: 14 June 2016 *Condition 7 (in AWDM/1541/13), which was instated as a condition of the approval of the last development at the property of 89 Old Fort Road, states that "to safeguard amenity and design integrity…and to comply with policy AH2 of the Adur local plan and national planning policy" permitted development rights have been removed, "for outbuildings of more than 10 cubic metres", from the property of 89 Old Fort Road.