Mrs S Tombs
115, Sompting Road
Lancing
West Sussex
BN15 9LG

09/02/11

Planning application ADC/0023/11

Hip-roofed single-storey rear extension and first floor west extension

117-119 Sompting Road, Lancing BN15 9LG

ADUR D.C.
BUILDING CONTROL
DEPARTMENT
11 FEB 2011

Dear Sirs,

With reference to the above planning application whilst the 1st floor development on the west side of the building appears not to be a problem I believe that the proposed new development to the rear of the property contravenes Adur District Council's Development Control Standard No. 3 in many ways.

Overshadowing (para 2.1) and Outlook (para 2.2 (ii)

The proportion of the garden taken up by the extension appears to be excessive. It does not fit with the character of the immediate area and is an over-development of the site. The regulations state that 'the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive'. Because it takes up most of the length of the plot and has a high pitched roof the proposed development will dominate one entire side of my garden. It will cast a shadow over my garden for the late afternoon and evening and detract from my enjoyment and use of the garden.

All the housing in this area is built to a common building line and therefore the gardens are uniformly open on three sides. This development will make mine the only garden with one side screened by a building.

Privacy (para 2.2 (i)

The two bedroom windows on the east side of the property are of particular concern to me because they will look directly into my garden. Conversely, I will be able to see directly into both bedrooms from my garden which will provide very little privacy for both myself and the occupants of the extension. If this development goes ahead it will breach the council's policy of maintaining rear gardens as 'completely private' (para 3.7).

In the event of this building being erected I would suggest that, although neither ideal nor desirable from my point of view, the occupants of 117-119 should be required to erect a boundary wall to the full maximum height allowed by the Planning Committee to ensure privacy for both parties.

Access and Parking (para 2.4)

The regulations stipulate that a dwelling with four bedrooms will require a minimum of three parking spaces. The new development will provide the property with a total of eight bedrooms and virtually no space will be made available for any parking. The fact that three new en-suit bathrooms will be provided would suggest that these rooms will be occupied by adults who may well have cars that will need to be parked. With the shop customers coming and going throughout the day and evening and the dental surgery situated opposite the shop parking is already a problem in the area. The staff of the dental surgery use on-street parking throughout the day because no space is provided for this on their premises and patients visiting the practise also park in the street. Leconfield Road, which runs alongside the property, is a narrow road which can already be difficult to negotiate because of parked cars and it is difficult to imagine where more space for residents could be found.

Amenity Space (paras 3.5 & Appendix)

The size of the development will be out of scale with the existing property and will not allow for an adequate garden area. Bearing in mind that the addition of the extension will now provide the property with 8 bedrooms the amenity space seems too small and does not provide enough room to incorporate refuse bins for both the living quarters and the shop, drying areas and recreation space for the residents.

Personal concerns

a) Height of roof

I am concerned about the height and pitch of the roof planned for the new extension. I believe from what I have read in the regulations that it is acceptable to have a flat roof on an extension and whilst it is possible that the applicants have designed the pitch of the roof to mirror the existing roof I feel that the height is excessive and will make the structure too imposing. I question whether the roof needs to be as high as shown to meet the requirements of the current proposal and feel that this could be reviewed. The roof height further adds to the problems of overshadowing and privacy mentioned above. Also, as I know that plans have been submitted in the past for a two storey extension I wonder if the occupants of 117-119 are providing the basis for future development of the loft space. Although I realise that this does not concern the committee at this time, should this be the case I could experience future problems with overlooking windows which would not be desirable.

b) Use of new premises

It seems strange to me that whilst access from the extension to the existing property goes through a lobby which has it's own exterior door, the new proposal includes it's own front door with an imposing porch. I cannot help but speculate that once the building is completed this connecting door will be removed or locked making the dwelling into a separate housing unit and not an extension as stated. The extension is shown to include two bedrooms and bathrooms with a good size living room and, although this is not shown on the plans, the addition of a small kitchen area in the living space would not require planning permission and would turn this into a separate living unit.

I am sure that the Planning Committee will take these matters into consideration when reviewing this application.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Sylvia Tombs