From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 26 November 2022 16:41
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1403/22

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/11/2022 4:41 PM from Mr Ivan Farrow.

Application Summary

Address:	12 Ring Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0QF
Proposal:	(Amended Plans showing addition of side screens including render wall and obscurely glazed panels and removal of west side dormer) Proposed single storey rear extension with roof terrace, lower ground floor raised terrace, rooms in roof consisting of dormer to east side roofslope
Case Officer:	Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Ivan Farrow
Address:	14 Ring Road, Lancing bn15 0qf

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I have reviewed the revised plans and have the following comments There has been no mention or correction to the statement in the application that the existing small terrace was carried out within Permitted Development Rights. This is not correct as the building is too tall and too near to my boundary. Also terraces and balconies are not permitted under PDR. The building was never completed and planning was never applied for, probably because the owner knew it would not be permitted. Hence no rights exist for the small balcony and the new terrace cannot built just because one is already there I have no problems with the roof mods providing safety, dirt and noise during construction are

rigidly controlled

I have no problem with the garden-level plans except for the railings and screens attached to their roofs (see later)

The new plain brick wall to the East of the existing balcony will be noise-effective but will be ugly and over-bearing. A design matching our scheme (ie half opaque glass) would be more pleasing in my opinion and look as though it had been designed to be there. It is also too near to our balcony if you insist on the extremely large proposed new terrace (see later)

The new construction of triple screens (#6) and the above wall severely reduces our Amenity re our terrace where we have breakfast, lunch and tea in fine weather . This is also our favourite entertaining area.

These walls and screens are only 1.6m from our boundary and greatly exceed the height permitted for such a close structure. The existing structure also exceeds the height limit but was never completed and permission was never applied for by the previous owners

The wall and three screens are all situated at one third of the distance that was acceptable a few years ago at 46 Mill Road (AWDM/1272/15) in similar circumstances
This house is adjacent to 12 Ring Road and shares the same N/S boundary line and so is directly comparable. The screening in this case had to be 5m from the boundary and I see no reason why this should not be the case at 12 Ring Road.

I know this standard is not a given in London from whence the applicant has recently moved but this a very different neighbourhood and we should not be coerced into lowering our local standards.

Why should we lose so much amenity for a very much larger neighbour's terrace which has no advantage in views compared to the existing terrace and views?

What is this very large terrace going to be used for? Large numbers of people having very noisy parties is the obvious answer. This would be totally unacceptable at only 1.6m from our boundary

The choice of railings that are ugly, noisy in the prevailing winds, and require considerable maintenance is strange. I speak from experience as I had to replace similar railings for these reasons.

The new terrace area will not be pleasant area with ugly railings to the South and large panels restricting the view like a horse's blinkers to either side

However if the screens and railings were deleted so that the new terrace was not a standing area I would accept the plans subject to revised details mentioned above

I understand that I can bring this to Committee if necessary and my successful experience of these committees leads me to believe that I would be successful. There would, necessarily, be further delay if this is what you want me to do

---

Kind regards