From: **Frances Wallace**
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 2026 at 13:16
Subject: Fw: can you email it to council as below?
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils

New Sender Alert! You don't often receive emails from this sender.

Allow sender | Block sender

Ref: AWDM/0545?26

Dear Sirs

I attach my comments re planning application on work cabin already built at 8 sdeahaven gardens

Thanks you

Planning (Development Management) Adur & Worthing Councils

19th October 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

AWDM/0545/26|Work cabin built on the rear of the garage (Retrospective)

Application at 8 Seahaven Gardens

I am writing to object to the above application, which directly adjoins my property at 7 Seahaven Gardens. The garage extension sits very close to our shared boundary. It is described as both a work cabin and as an office/workstation/storage on the plans, complete with a toilet and shower.

I note that the works have already been carried out over the past 7 months, so I have been able to see the impact for myself. I was advised it would be a small lean-to extension, but I feel the scale is far larger than that originally suggested. I appreciate that the retrospective nature of the application is not in itself a reason for refusal. However, it means the harm described below is real rather than predicted.

Grounds of objection

1. Scale, bulk and proximity to the boundary

The extension roughly doubles the footprint of the original garage, to approximately about 49 sqm, or a 59m2 including a roof overhang. The original garage seems to be approx 26sqm. The site plan gives no dimensions or neighbouring context, but seems to be built within a metre of the boundary. There is also a mezzanine level. For a linked garage outbuilding, that is excessive. It is out of proportion with the main house and the garden it sits in. It also appears overbearing and dominant when seen from my property. It is now the size of a separate dwelling.

Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 requires development to respect the character of the area and to be appropriate in scale, height and massing. In my view, this extension fails that test.

2. Loss of daylight, sunlight and outlook

Because of its height and proximity to the boundary, the extension appears to block light from reaching my conservatory which I previously enjoyed. Policy 15 specifically protects neighbouring homes from unacceptable loss of daylight, sunlight and outlook. I ask the council to require a daylight and sunlight assessment, following BRE guidance, before deciding the application.

3. Possible use as a separate dwelling

The extension appears to include a shower room, WC and mezzanine floor level. Together with its size, this suggests it is intended to be used as self-contained living accommodation, not as a garage or space ancillary to the main house. A workshop of this size, far larger than a small home office, also has the potential to cause noise and disturbance in a residential setting, and I wish to protect my amenity from this. The plans do not note the materials of construction, and it is not clear whether building regulations were obtained. If the council is minded to approve, I ask that conditions be attached. The condition should restrict the building to uses incidental to the main house and prevent its use as a separate dwelling or sleeping accommodation, or restrict its use as a separate workshop, with noise mitigation detailed.

4. Accuracy of the submitted plans

I have concerns that the plans do not accurately reflect what has been built. I was aware of extensive foundation digging and cannot be sure the proposal does not create a lower ground level. The plans also do not make it clear what materials were used, as I'm unsure whether the extension is finished or still requires cladding, etc. I ask the case officer to visit the site, check the measurements, and inspect the interior before determining the application.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, I believe the application is contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017, because of its scale, bulk and impact upon neighbouring amenity. I do not believe it is

subordinate and appropriate, particularly noting its proximity to my property. I would like the Council to assess the light to my property and check the plans against what has been built. I urge the Council to refuse the application and take enforcement action to have the extension removed or at least reduced.

I received this letter 7 days after the date stated, and as I'm going away next week, I feel slightly rushed into this representation and would like the option to extend the consultation period should I need to add anything further to my representation.

Yours faithfully,

Frances Wallace

7 Seahaven Gardens