Debbie Johnson

From: Planning
Sent: 12 May 2014 14:10
To: Planning
Subject: Application Comments for AWDM/0447/14

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

Comments were submitted at 2:09 PM on 12 May 2014 from Mr & Mrs Kevin & Madhu Hall.

Application Summary

Address: 12 East Meadway Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RF

Proposal: Removal of existing pitched roof and first floor within. Extension to front (south) elevation and addition of two new storeys to provide first and second floor accommodation including internal alterations to form new side entrance.

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr & Mrs Kevin & Madhu Hall

Email: [redacted]

Address: 14 East Meadway Shoreham-by-Sea

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

Comments: The top level description of this proposal describes it as an extension, but in fact it is a complete redesign. The character and size of the existing building will be totally changed. The proposed new design for No. 12 resembles an airfield control tower and as such is more suitable to a very open area than a residential road such as East Meadway. Allowing a large three storey development in a road which is predominantly single storey, pitched roof style will set a dangerous precedent. The addition of an elevated terrace means that the overlook from No. 12 is considerably increased. This terrace appears to potentially extend along either side of the second floor bedroom. The drawings show what appears to be a large glazed panel on either side of the second floor landing. This will increase the overlook of our garden, as will the

rear first floor windows. The fact that the third level is slightly set back does not reduce its overall visual impact on neighbouring properties. The design statement refers to No. 10 as an existing three storey house, thereby seeking to justify increasing the height of this building to a third level. In fact the second floor of No. 10 is a narrow space entirely within the envelope of the pitched roof, which begins at first floor level. This is in total contrast to the much larger volume envisaged by this proposal. It therefore does not justify the second floor as planned. Our property, No. 14, is a chalet bungalow which will be dwarfed by the proposed new tower design. The enlarged side elevation of the proposed building greatly reduces the daylight available to our west facing windows. At present our ground floor west facing front window is unobstructed by neighbouring buildings and provides significant daylight to our lounge. The proposed three storey south extension will obstruct the window and significantly reduce the daylight available. This effect will be even worse in winter months. Considerable daylight is currently available for our west facing dining room window. The proposed enlargement eliminates this almost completely. A consequence of the removal of the pitched roof at the rear of No. 12 will be to increase the overlook of our garden from No.10. At present the roof of No. 12 obscures this. We are very concerned about the risk of asbestos being released during the partial demolition of a building of this age. The disruption involved in such major demolition and rebuilding work will be considerable. The green benefits mentioned in the design statement can be obtained in a more sympathetic design, without the increase in overlook and loss of daylight this proposal imposes. Similarly the rough concrete blocks referred to can be rendered properly without a total rebuild.