Sharon Leishman

From: Planning
Sent: 20 December 2013 20:01
To: Planning
Subject: Application Comments for AWDM/1520/13

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

Comments were submitted at 8:00 PM on 20 Dec 2013 from Mr and Mrs Nigel and Angie Turner.

Application Summary

Address: 69 The Avenue Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5GJ

Proposal: Conservatory on south side and extension of timber fence to partially enclose front garden

Case Officer: Lawrence Simmons

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr and Mrs Nigel and Angie Turner

Email: [redacted]

Address: 24 The Avenue Shoreham-by-Sea

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Loss of General Amenity
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments: 1. South Side Conservatory. We have no representations to make regarding the proposed conservatory to the south side of the property. 2. Extension of Boundary Fence. We strongly object to the proposed extension of the 2m high boundary fence. The Avenue is one of Shoreham's ancient "droveways" which led from the Downs to St Nicholas Church and Old Shoreham, in an area designated as of outstanding natural beauty. It is incumbent on the planning authority and residents of The Avenue to preserve the open character and appearance of this historical byway. The quadrangle of houses echoes the layout of former farm buildings on the site, and when initially developed had low level white chain-link between the properties thereby creating a very open aspect to the close. Extending the fence would have a substantial and detrimental impact on the character of the road, and the amenity of other householders in the close of houses. Extension of the fence would create an urban-like appearance not all compatible with the character of the area. It would also create a precedent of allowing high fences which may be followed by some others. The existing fence provides security and privacy for the rear garden in which the conservatory is to be erected. We see no reasonable

justification to further extend the fencing as proposed. The front garden is already bordered by a mixed species hedge which requires little more than to be managed in accordance with good arboricultural practice – continuing the height of the existing fence. We would hope that the mature hedging which previously screened the existing fence, and was recently ripped out, will be reinstated and maintained. 3. Consultation. While the Council is formally consulting with four immediate neighbours, we are extremely surprised that other residents of the close of houses are not being given the opportunity to submit representations. The proposed extension of the boundary fence would create a "barrack-like" effect which would impact on the aspect and amenity of the close, and potentially on the value of properties. 4. Accuracy of Plan. We were surprised to note that the plans submitted in early December 2013 do not show a ground-floor extension to the eastern side of the property constructed during summer of this year.