From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 February 2025 10:11:08 UTC+00:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0105/25

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/02/2025 10:11 AM from Mr Lee Mason.

Application Summary

Address:	48 Lime Tree Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0DP
Proposal:	Removal of roof and erection of additional floor to form a two-storey house with rear balcony and single storey side extension
Case Officer:	Jackie Fox

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Lee Mason
Address:	50 Lime Tree Avenue, Worthing, West Sussex BN14 0DP

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	As immediate neighbours to this property, we strongly object to this proposal and believe it will have a detrimental impact on our privacy and amenities. Furthermore, the proposal conflicts with the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and Worthing Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) on housing extensions (Extending and Altering Your Home - Supplementary Planning Guidance). Number 48 is directly south of our property and so the

effect on light will be greater (as detailed below). We also have solar panels on the southern elevation of our roof area and whilst this can probably not be taken into account I feel it is worth noting.

Worthing Local Plan 2023

The proposal conflicts with Policy DM5 in several respects.
- The two-storey dwelling on this highly visible corner plot would stand out awkwardly in an area where single-storey homes with attic conversions define the character. Its height and scale wouldn't fit with the surrounding properties, making it look out of place rather than respecting the established pattern of development.
- With the ridge height being raised by approximately 1.7m, the proposal would disrupt the street scene, as its bulk and prominence would break the uniform roofline of properties along Lime Street Ave and Cissbury Drive, and alter the area's open feel. Instead of blending in, it would dominate the surroundings, overshadow our property to the north, and negatively impact the local built environment.
- Rather than contributing to the area's character, the development would create an abrupt contrast that feels out of sync with its surroundings and will not reinforce the established sense of place.
- The proposal will have an unacceptable impact on us as neighbours through the loss of privacy as a result of the proposed balcony, as well as the loss of daylight and sunlight due to the increased massing of the property and its position immediately adjoining our boundary.
This policy also required development proposals to take into account relevant SPDs. However, we believe that there are clear conflicts with the SPD on house extensions, as explained below.
Extending and Altering Your Home SPD

This guidance states that "The size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature. Therefore, the extension should not be higher than, or in front of, the main house."

The proposal will directly conflict with this guidance, and the original house will be unrecognisable if the extension and alterations are permitted.

On impacts to neighbours, the guidance sets out, "A carefully designed extension is important in order to reduce its potential impact on your neighbours. Such consideration should avoid any excessive loss of light and privacy and will reduce any overbearing effect of the extension."

Currently, the rear of the property is staggered and mostly set back from our boundary. However, the proposal will extend into this setback, resulting in an enlarged dwelling that directly adjoins

our boundary with eaves rising to 3 meters, causing overshadowing. As this section of the building is located directly south of our conservatory, it is likely to block sunlight from reaching this part of our property.

No sunlight or daylight study has been conducted to assess the development's impact on natural light reaching the rear of our garden and conservatory. This information is essential for a proper evaluation of how the proposal will affect natural light availability to our property.

We are very concerned over the proposed first floor balcony as this will have direct views over our rear garden. The balcony is orientated so that it faces towards our garden, and the 2m high frosted glazing only serves to prevent views towards the side of our house and the road. Unlike internal rooms where windows that have the potential to overlook can be frosted, the balcony provides a clear line of sight over all of our rear garden.

Whilst we are not against all development and indeed our property and neighbouring properties have been extended into the roof space, the proposed development is excessive in scale, out of character with the surrounding area, and would have an unacceptable impact on our privacy and living conditions. Its height and massing would dominate the street scene, overshadow our property, and reduce natural light, while the first-floor balcony would create intrusive overlooking. The proposal conflicts with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and the Council's design guidance, which seeks to protect local character and residential amenities. Given these clear policy breaches, planning permission should be refused.

Kind regards