From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 17 October 2021 17:41
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1180/21

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 17/10/2021 5:41 PM from Mr Adrian Holmes.

Application Summary

Address: 9 The Street Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5NJ

Proposal: (Amended plans received to show revised design and siting and removal of existing garage building) Application for Listed Building Consent for single storey building to south to provide a kitchen and bedroom with a shower room with glazed link to connect the new and existing buildings.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Adrian Holmes

Address: 23 Lesser Foxholes, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5NT

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Other
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: In relation to the current proposal for an extension to 9 The Street, we note the revision to the original proposal is a substantial one, and now wish to make the comments below.

Our property (23 Lesser Foxholes) adjoins the proposers' plot, and is further down the hill, than the proposers' property. The height of the proposed extension is at the level of the top of the second-floor window of the cottage, so that the proposed extension would be an imposing presence next to our rear garden. So much so that the level of the roof would appear to be at the same height as our first-floor bedroom and bathroom windows.

Early to mid-morning light into our rear garden, kitchen and dining room currently comes largely through gaps in

the 3 trees in the corner of the proposers' garden. This light would be substantially blocked by the proposed extension. Removal of the trees, which has been mooted would make little to no difference to this situation.

Although it has been suggested by the proposers' architect that light into the rear of our plot would be increased by the removal of the existing garage (the base of which is well below our side entrance walkway ground level), we consider that any increased light at the south east corner would not illuminate our living space. Our awning over the rear pathway would block much of the increased light, and the light lost via the positioning and height of the proposed extension would not be replaced.

As our property has been in situ since 1976, and we have lived in the property for 20 years, we believe the Prescription Act 1832 and/or the Rights of Light Act 1959 apply. Similarly, it would appear from the architect's drawings that the proposed extension would infringe the 45° rule commonly used by planning authorities.

The proposed extension moves the proposers' living area to be very close to our rear garden and side entrance. Although the proposed kitchen windows, which would face our property are relatively shallow in height, they are so close to the boundary fence as to allow our entire rear garden to be viewed at close proximity and to give a view into our kitchen and dining room. This constitutes a significant invasion of our privacy, both within our house and also our quiet enjoyment of the garden.

The solution suggested to this is a higher garden wall than in the current proposal. This solution would further reduce the light to our property that would otherwise have come over the proposed glass link walkway. Also, our rear bathroom and bedroom, would still be within view from the proposed windows.

To summarise: the kitchen part of the proposed extension is simply too close to the boundary, and, in general, the height and length of the proposed extension would block light, an issue that could not be mitigated by minor fixes.

The above focuses on the impact of the proposal on our property. In addition, we would like to make some general observations below:

1. We had no objection to the previous extension proposal which we considered to be sensitive to potential conservation concerns as it would be largely screened by the boundary hedge. The light and privacy problems highlighted above did not appear to be significantly present in that proposal.

2. However, the re-positioning of the proposed extension building, and the move of the proposed glass link walkway from the entrance lobby of the cottage to the middle of the side elevation of the cottage, brings the

extension into much greater prominence relative to the original cottage. We consider this to be a significant cause of concern from a conservation perspective.

3. Referencing comments made by others in relation the original proposal, we don't see how the comments made by the occupants of no 8 The Street are addressed by the revised proposal, and we note that point no 4 in the letter of 27th July 2021 from James Brecknell Architects no longer applies, as we are now making that particular point.

4. The Design and Access Statement and Site Analysis documents, when considering the original alternative options, focussed on issues with:

a. pressure on the boundary hedge (which the Statement stresses the value of), and
b. competition between the cottage and the extension.

The Statement makes clear that the other options were sub-optimal in relation to these aspects. The current proposal repositions the extension to a location apparently identical to those originally rejected by the proposers. Therefore, we conclude that the current proposal must be considered to have the same flaws. These issues do not appear to be addressed in any of the documents on the Council planning applications website.

In short, the current proposal is a marked downgrade from the original proposal, and to our very considerable detriment.

Kind regards