Raymond A Robinson

158 Western Road, Sompting, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 9TY

[redacted]

Adur & Worthing Council
Development Management
Economy Directorate, Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing, West Sussex
BN11 1HS

ADUR & WORTHING
- 8 APR 2015
PLANNING SERVICES

Date: 7th April 2015

Enc. Attachment Pages 1&2

Your ref: AWDM/0412/15

Dear Sir

Attention: Rebecca Tier

Re: Retrospective application for retention of conservatory glazing and roof.

160 Western Road Sompting, Lancing West Sussex

We attach our concerns and objections in the above mentioned matter and would like the attached pages considered in the decision making process.

Yours sincerely

R A Robinson [redacted]

Susan M Dyer [redacted]

Attachment - Page One

Concerns & Objections

Re: Retrospective application for retention of conservatory glazing and roof.

160 Western Road Sompting, Lancing West Sussex

Description of Existing Use, Building Works or Activity

Application narrative:
"Retrospective roof alterations to existing conservatory S/77/03/TP approved 29/01/04"
(Householder Application for Planning permission for works or extension to a dwelling)

Comment:
The existing conservatory was taken down to its foundations, prominently advertised for sale in the front garden of 160 Western Road for a while and ultimately sold on the internet via 'Facebook'. The new conservatory/orangery* is therefore a new build from its brick base foundation to its roof.
*The owner/occupier describes this new build as an 'orangery'.

Plan AWDM/0412/15
All elevations on this plan depict the roof as ***not*** going into the eaves of the existing structure. However, in reality the conservatory roof ***does*** go into the eaves. The effect of that is to create a mismatch of the main building rear guttering i.e. guttering on the conservatory roof is considerably higher than the main building guttering which in turn means the vertical glazing is taller than the original permitted conservatory. The latest plan for which approval is sought still does not match the actuality.

The main gutter has therefore been cut to accommodate that mismatch - with no consultation or permission from us - with new lead flashing work positioned under the tiles above the conservatory roof line causing rainwater runoff and roof detritus that would normally be shared equally, to run into our side of the main rainwater soak away gutter and downpipe; if the roof had been constructed as shown in the plan that would not occur.

The overall height of the new building is therefore materially higher than the original authority contained in S/77/03/TP and should be considered a ***new building*** and not just a new roof on an old structure.

Height of vertical panes & Privacy issues
The height of the vertical panes on the south elevation cause privacy concerns, particularly as it is possible (is so desired, or by accident e.g. cleaning of internal/external panes) to see into our bedroom if we have the shutters in the open position. That is not acceptable.

Environmental issues & light pollution at unsocial times
The conservatory roof has several built in mains current flush mounted high intensity lights in its wooden construction. When these are switched on and turned up they cause light pollution in our bedroom and on our property in general. We cannot therefore, have our shutters open at the same time these lights are on if we are in the room in question.

Potential build & classification issues

a) The roof line of the conservatory has been built so that it almost impinges on the boundary line separating the two bungalows. With mains powered lighting in a hollow sealed wooden construction there is a risk of fire through short circuiting etc...

   Due to the proximity of this potential hazard to our home, can the builders or owner/occupier certify that certified fire resistant/retardant materials have been used in the construction of the roof to satisfy our insurers?

b) The conservatory is heated by piping hot water to a radiator from the main building's central heating system, as it is permanently attached to the main building via the eaves it could be considered homogenous to the main building.

   We have been advised the conservatory may not qualify as a separate and discrete building because of that and therefore would be excluded from any permitted exemptions - the conservatory would no longer be a seasonally occupied building but essentially a centrally heated double glazed ground floor extension.

Appearance & compliance issue

We understand the planning relaxation rules concerning single story developments between May 2013 and May 2016 sets out specific points of guidance, one of which is that, quote: *Materials to be similar in appearance to the existing house.* End quote. That is clearly not so in this case.

The structure tends to dominate our view from anywhere in our garden and cannot be ignored. The contrasting white of the double glazed panels with the black felt roof is dramatically not in sympathy with the existing building and appears incongruous with its top heavy stepped roof continually in view.

R A Robinson [redacted]

(Owner/occupier 158 Western Road)

Mrs S M Dyer [redacted]

(Partner)