James Delaney and Helen Callaghan
26 Ravensbourne Avenue,
Shoreham-By-Sea
BN43 6AB

[redacted]

ADUR & WORTHING
30 SEP 2019
PLANNING SERVICES

Dear Gary Peck and Hannah Barker,

Planning Application: AWDM/1454/19
2 Cypress Close, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 6AE

We write in connection to the letters received on 13th September and 25th September 2019 regarding the planning application reference, AWDM/1454/19. We have examined the latest triple dormer major development plans in detail and wish to **object** to the major development, based on the relevant planning consideration listed on the notice letter and the Adur District Management Standard No.2 document.

We are objecting based on the below:

1. The re-orientation of the west side of the house which is the side that will be on our boundary, will mean that the main entrance into the house, the entrance to the garden, the main windows have been reconfigured to this side, meaning that there will be constant **noise** as every day activities occur on the same side of the house. As the property is being converted from a two-bedroom bungalow to a four-bedroom house this drastically increases foot traffic from increased residents, visitors and this only exasperates the **noise** and **privacy** concerns.

2. We have increased concerns over the two west facing dormers with large windows overlooking our property, this will result in multiple windows looking into our house and garden resulting in an unacceptable loss of **privacy** as our property will be overlooked continually throughout the day and night. The outlook from our kitchen, lounge, bedrooms and garden will all have a line of sight into Cypress Close first-floor bedrooms, this will go both ways and in effect create a back to back property, effecting our **privacy** and creating a **cramping** effect.

3. In addition to the loss of **privacy**, from the dormers we also must deal with the fact that they will have a negative impact on the resale value of our property. We purchased our property taking consideration that we are not **overlooked**; this was the main advantage of the house when we purchased 16 months ago. With the planned proposal, we will be very **overlooked** by multiple large windows. All windows will have a viewpoint into our bedrooms, lounge and kitchen and rear garden along with the full length and breadth of the back garden therefore having a negative effect on the resale value of our property and lives day to day. This will also result in the outlook from the rear of our property being drastically changed from open skies to seeing the neighbours' windows, front door and multiple back doors.

4. The plans also stipulate that there will be two rooflights and a lantern window (huge skylight) in addition to the triple framed windows on the two west facing dormers along with an undetermined number of downlights. This will cause an unnecessary amount of **light**

pollution on the east side of our house as it will direct huge amounts of light at our property, especially the bedrooms causing further **disturbance** and loss of **privacy**. Any extension needs to be in keeping with the **appearance**, **scale**, **design** and **character** of the **existing property** and the **street**, we strongly object as this plan breaks all these principles, most notably the excessive dormers and the latest addition of skylights (especially the large lantern over the kitchen). The sheer quantity of windows that will be facing our property with direct views into our lounge, kitchen, bedrooms and garden is unacceptable. The development needs to be restricted because of this.

5. We also have apprehensions over the issue of sewage, there is a manhole to a sewage pipe that also runs under our back garden, we have concerns that the scale of the development will have negative effects on this system and effecting the sewerage and drainage in the rear of our property. We did mention this in our first objection letter. Please can you provide us with information where we can discuss our concerns further to ensure that this matter will not have a negative effect on our property.

6. The previous application "AWDM/1048/19" stated wrongly that no **materials** will be required for the building of this large dwelling, this was clearly a falsehood and raises the fact that this is a financially driven extension, not one for the betterment of the people who wish to live in the area. This is true again for this proposed money-making proposal.

Finally, we need to raise serious concerns over the way the latest proposal "AWDM/1454/19" has been put forward, it is clearly a strategic move by the developer. Firstly, they submitted a grossly out of proportion development that was thankfully rejected after much stress and effort by the community. This has been followed by a largely reduced and more acceptable plan in comparison to the first. This has subsequently and very quickly had further amendments (i.e. additional West & East dormers) which gradually takes it back to the **over developed** scale of the original plan. It is clearly a strategy applied by seasoned property developers to overwhelm us and existing residents with administration overheads, undue stress causing negative effects on mental health, not to mention the confusion over the additions to existing plans. This blatant strategic manipulation of the system and indecent tactic needs to be taken into consideration for the appeal, as this has reverted to its original plan of being an over-developed property to ensure maximum profit margin for a business and not to benefit an existing family home or to enhance the surrounding area and community.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that we would like to speak at the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Yours Faithfully,

James Delaney and Helen Callaghan