From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 September 2024 13:33:51 UTC+01:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1137/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 19/09/2024 1:33 PM from Mr MALCOLM SOUCH.

Application Summary

Address:	24 Rose Walk Worthing West Sussex BN12 4AU
Proposal:	Remodelling of existing dwelling, consisting of rooms in roof by raising the roof ridge, new windows to East and West first floor, South facing dormer and roof lights to North and South.|cr|New Single storey Side extension. Render to all elevations.|cr|
Case Officer:	Amanda Haslett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr MALCOLM SOUCH
Address:	26 Rose Walk, Worthing, West Sussex BN12 4AU

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	We are the owners and occupiers of No 26 Rose Walk, which adjoins the application site on the North side. The proposal to raise the roof and increase the height of the side extension will have a significant impact on our property. Our bungalow is to the north of the proposals, and our kitchen and

side paved area benefit from sunshine over the existing adjacent house. This will be considerably impacted by the proposals. We do however reluctantly accept that raising the roof line of no 24 has been previously approved, and we have to accept the principle of raising the roof ridge is established.

We do however have further concerns about this proposal.

Firstly in relation to overlooking, and secondly in relation to the height of the proposed extension adjacent to our property.

Overlooking.

Our concerns relate to the proposed roof lights on the north elevation. These look directly into our kitchen, which is only 5.5m away. We understand why they are wanted, but ask for a condition that they shall have obscured glass and a cill height of at least 1.7 metres above the floor of the rooms in which the windows are installed.

We discussed this matter with the Applicants on 19th September, and they are happy for such a condition to be imposed.

The height of the side extension.

We welcome the removal of the existing ugly, untidy and poorly maintained extension, but we are concerned about its height.

The existing wall on the boundary adjacent to the proposed extension is 1.910m high. The drawings give a proposed height of 2.6m, but there is also a thick line above the end of the dimension line. It is not clear what this line is supposed to be, but it is about another 200mm thick. This 690mm increase (from 1.91 to 2.6m), is a significant figure, and if the thick line has to be included, it is even worse. This wall is directly opposite our kitchen window, on the boundary, and only 3.57m away. The proposal will significantly reduce the amount of sunlight in our external paved area, where we regularly sit, because it is sheltered from the wind. It will also look very overbearing from our kitchen window.

The existing garage wall on the boundary is 2.6m high, the extension as proposed will therefore be the same height as the adjoining existing wall. We see no reason why the wall has to be so high. The existing garage wall has a parapet about 200mm high, which is unnecessary. If the extension were to have an internal height the same as the garage, then this wall could be reduced by about 200mm below the proposed height, along its whole length, including the existing garage. On the garage this would offer a minor improvement to the outlook from our lounge window, and for the extension, considerably lessen the impact of the reduction in sunlight and outlook from our kitchen. We would accept a wall height of 2.4m.

We are concerned as to how the roof edge and top of the wall will be constructed. The treatment of this roof edge is very visible to us, and its detailing is important. We would not wish to see any material used which requires regular maintenance, because it will not be visible to the Applicants and will likely deteriorate and look unsightly, (as has happened to the existing construction). The 200mm thick black line on the drawing, as referred to earlier, should be clarified.

In summary we would like the following conditions in relation to this wall:

The wall on the North boundary shall not exceed 2.4m high, above the adjoining ground level, along its entire length.

The wall shall be finished on the North side in a cement render to match the existing adjacent garage wall, and shall be painted in a colour to be agreed with the owners of No 26 Rose Walk.

The top of the wall and roof edge shall be capped in a durable material that does not require regular maintenance.

We discussed this matter with the Applicants on 19th September, and they are happy for such conditions to be imposed.

Janet and Malcolm Souch
19 September 2024

Kind regards