Gmail by Google

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

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1769/15

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 4 January 2016 at 21:36
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 9:36 PM on 04 Jan 2016 from Mr Kevin Mannall.

Application Summary

Address:	198 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6BG
Proposal:	Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 8m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 3.3m and height of eaves of the extension 3m
Case Officer:	Sarah Crease

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Kevin Mannall
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	Not Available

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	We are writing to submit a formal objection to the above proposed development. Current situation We reside at 196 Upper Shoreham Road. Our kitchen is at the rear of the property adjacent to the boundary of No 198. The distance between the side walls of the two properties is approximately 2 m. No 198 has a flat roof rear extension measuring 3 m with a height of approx. 2.5 m. The side window of the kitchen at No 196 faces this extension (at a distance of c2m - see above) but does not currently suffer from a loss of light or overbearing effect since the low height of the extension at No 198 allows adequate natural light and outlook. The extension at No 198 does not currently reach beyond the rear wall of No 196 and thus presents no obstruction or overbearing presence. Proposed Development It is

proposed to build a single storey extension to the rear of No 198 measuring 8m from the rear of the original house, maximum height 3.3m and height of eaves of the extension 3m. The net effect on No 196 would be - to raise the height of the vertical wall (2m from the window at No 196) by approx. 0.8m and to further impinge on light and outlook by the addition of eaves rising to a further 3m. - to extend No 198 some 4.5m beyond the rear wall of No 196 - this being within c1m of the boundary fence and obstructing light to the whole of the ground floor rear of No196, along with presenting a overbearing and oppressive presence and a total loss of outlook. We object to this development on the following grounds. -The Adur Development Control Standards (DCS) for extensions and alteration s to dwellings state (Policy AH7) that an objective should be that "proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings". It is our view that this objective cannot be met by the proposed development. -This DCS also states (Section 2.1) that "one of the main planning concerns is to ensure that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties", (Section 2.2ii) that any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent", and (Section 2.2iii) that "the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive". It is our view that the proposed development would clearly have these adverse effects. -This DCS also states, in relation to rear extensions (Section 3.2) that "the closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property". The c1m proximity to the boundary of No 196 makes the adverse effect inevitable. -The Adur DCS for space around buildings, in addition to endorsing (Policy AH2) the above objectives state (Section 2.12) that "the position of a building on a plot should also take into consideration the position of buildings on adjoining plots. Dwellings should not project significantly beyond the rear of adjoining dwellings particularly if they are close to side boundaries since this would be overbearing and lead to loss of light and outlook. A general rule of thumb guide is that there should be no development beyond a 45 degree area measured from the nearest rear window of the neighbouring dwelling". The proposed development completely fails to meet this criteria in respect of both the side and rear kitchen widows of No 196. - The Adur Planning Portal Website states (no8) "if an extension is within 2m of a boundary maximum eaves site should be no higher that 3m" We consider that the proposed development would be completely detrimental to our property and living conditions for the reasons stated above and trust that our objections, supporting evidence and references to Council policies which support our case will be taken fully

into consideration.