From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 15 April 2024 20:45:39 UTC+01:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0402/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2024 8:45 PM from Mr David Bell.

Application Summary

Address:	27 Alexandra Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2DU
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey garage / side extension with front and rear dormers
Case Officer:	Jackie Fox

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr David Bell
Address:	28 Alexandra Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 2DU

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I oppose the plans in their current format due to the below. Given the height difference between this design and the previous application appears to be only 20 to 30cm lower I have broadly the same concerns as previously stated under AWDM/1488/23 1. Bulk and necessity - The extension reaches a height of 5.50 metres composed of two aspects 1st floor height appears to be higher than the proposed 3.04

metres at the highest point in the first application. This new application has a ground floor height indicated of 2.3 metres. Given the overall height is shown is 5.5 metres I believe that an upper floor height of 3.2 metres is excessive even after allowing for joists and insulation depth. The average ceiling height in the UK is 2.4 metres so 3.2 metres at the highest point is c33% higher than the UK ceiling height

Even in my own property, an Edwardian property, the highest ceiling I have is 2.8 metres.

2. Light - I would like confirmation that the current plans do not impact our light. This can be a subjective topic so I would welcome independent confirmation that the 25 degree rule has been considered and that light into my property will not be impacted by this proposal given the 5.5 metre height.

3. Aesthetics - every other property on the street has a view opposite of either a Victorian or Edwardian property. No other house has such as gap between it and the next property. If the gap is to be developed then I do believe that it should be in keeping with the street. The view from our property will be almost straight onto the extension. There are two aspects I would comment on

A. I believe the extension will look rather unusual given the ground floor has a height of 2.3 metres (reduced from 2.68 on the first application) and the upper floor will have a height of 3.2 metres (I believe this has increased from the 3.04 metres on the first application). I feel this will give it a 'top heavy' look which is not in keeping with what other neighbours look onto.

B. I note that on the design and access statement that it is "hoped that the changes in the height and mass of the proposal will meet the LPA requirement for the proposed extension to appear Subservient to the main Host dwelling.". Unless I am mistaken the overall height has reduced from 5.7 metres on the initial application to 5.5 metres. A 20cm reduction (a reduction of 3.5%) does not, I would argue, represent a significant reduction in height.

In summary I understand my neighbours desire for an extension but would encourage a reduction in height beyond the 20cm offered so it does not impact the light coming into my property and my neighbours who have also logged comments.

Kind regards