74 Elms Drive
Lancing
W Sussex
BN15 9LR

24th November 2009

Planning Services
Adur District Council
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 6PR

Dear Sirs,

REF: ADC/0443/09 - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION TO 76 ELMS DRIVE, LANCING, W SUSSEX

Thank you for your letter of 19th November 2009 in which you informed me of the above planning application.

Having viewed the application and associated documents on the Public*Access* Planning website I am replying to strongly object to this application as I believe it may contravene the planning guidance as stated in the document 'Development Control Standard No 3 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' shown on your website.

Objection 1

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow which adjoins my own property. Both properties have pre-existing projecting rear elevations. The effect of the proposed works will be to construct an infill extension of the type depicted in the left hand drawing within section 3.3 of the 'Development Control Standard No 3' document. This would leave a room in my property in 'deep recess' as shown in the Document and which is clearly described as an '**Unacceptable Infill Extension**'. For this reason I cannot see that the application can be approved.

Objections 2 &3

Notwithstanding the above, in addition Section 2.2 of 'Development Control Standard No 3' ('The Effect on Neighbouring Properties') indicates that proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an ***unacceptably adverse effect*** on neighbouring properties – in particular in relation to:

- Daylight - section2.2 (ii) - the creation of the 'deep recess' as described above will most certainly have an unacceptably adverse effect on my property.

- Outlook - section 2.2 (iii) – as the proposed extension comes to the boundary line between both properties, the outlook from my property will be dominated by the extension as it will be overbearing and oppressive. Section 2.3 of the Standard also refers.

Objection 4

Notwithstanding the above objections, Section 3.2 of Standard 3 indicates that on semi-detached dwellings single-storey rear extensions (such as that proposed) which abut or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling (as is the case with this application) should normally be no deeper than 3.5m. The drawing accompanying the application does not specifically show the dimensions of the proposed extension and being elderly and mobility-impaired I have no ability to try and measure the likely size of the proposed extension. I assume, however, that this will be considered as part of the application process.

Even if the proposed extension is less than 3.5m deep, my other objections still apply.

Please confirm that you have received this letter and have logged it as an official objection and keep me informed as to the outcome?

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Mrs P G Dale

cc:
Councillor Carol Bradburn c/o Adur District Council
Councillor Jaynie Sykes-Strudwick c/o Adur District Council