From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 April 2024 13:55:46 UTC+01:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0402/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 12/04/2024 1:55 PM from Mr Tom Burch.

Application Summary

Address:	27 Alexandra Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2DU
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey garage / side extension with front and rear dormers
Case Officer:	Jackie Fox

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Tom Burch
Address:	First Floor Flat, 26 Alexandra Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 2DU

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	AWDM/0402/24 To whom it may concern, I appreciate the desire of the owners of the property to improve the garage and would support an application to demolish it if the

replacement was only single storey. However, I object to the two storey application. There is a precedent for a garage development in Alexandra Road adjacent to number 1 Alexandra Road. In my view an application similar to this would be acceptable as long as the axis of the pitched roof is East-West.
The applicants have distributed a letter to neighbours suggesting that the neighbours might like to support the application. This only has the effect of annoying the neighbours and asks them to approach the applicants with their views on the application (copy available on request). Is this allowed under planning rules? If not then the application should be summarily dismissed.
The applicants previously submitted a similar application (AWDM/1488/23) which was withdrawn. This new application does nothing to overcome the previous objections in terms of loss of light as the supposedly altered height shows no significant change. Therefore, the previous objections are still valid and should be taken into account when making any planning decision based on this application.
The previous application showed a West facing window. This has now been altered to be an East facing window. This proposed window would look directly into our front room which would result in a loss of privacy. Please ensure that removal of this window or changing it to a West facing view is a condition if this application is approved.
I believe that there is a "25 degree" rule concerning loss of light. This development would cause loss of light to our front garden (and, therefore, our enjoyment of it) under this rule at its present intended height. Under the same rule there would also be significant loss of light to our downstairs neighbour. I would welcome an independent assessment for loss of light at all properties concerned between 22 and 30 Alexandra Road. If this is not done then I feel that this would be a lack of due diligence on the part of the applicants (who should be required to pay for the assessment and publish the results) and Adur Worthing Council.
The development would also cause almost complete loss of light to two of the properties at 23 Alexandra Road on their North facing walls.
The applicants in the Design and Access Statement have used numerous emotional adjectives throughout it which are deliberately intended to influence the decision making process. These words include the words "poorly constructed sub standard, unattractive, prefabricated, discordant, clashes, modest, enhance and respect" there may be more. As stated above these are emotional cues intended to influence the decision. These emotional adjectives should be removed when considering the application.
As mentioned above the new application does nothing to address the height issues of the previous application. In the new application the Design and Access Statement paragraph 5 states that "It is now hoped" that the changes in height will meet the LPA requirement. What is the LPA requirement and does this meet it or not? Nebulous statements like "hoped" are not helpful to anyone.

Are we conned by the applicant and their architects with terms like this? The architects should know what they are talking about.
In paragraph 1 of the Design and Access Statement it is stated that the design is for "Habitable Office Space". The building regulations have three definitions of habitable (parts B, F and M) none of which refers to office in the definition. Therefore, there is no such thing as "Habitable Office Space". Either the accommodation is habitable or it is an office space it cannot be both.
If the accommodation is habitable then it will likely attract an occupier with a car which will increase the number of cars in the area (which is what the applicants allegedly seek to reduce) and will increase the population density in the area (which is already high).
Alexandra Road is a residential road not for business / office use. If the space is to be used as an office then it will likely attract employees which will again increase the number of cars in the area (see above). Further, if the development is to be used as an office space then Adur Worthing Council should re-assess the property for council tax and business rates (again due diligence on the part of AWC).
The applicants should not be able to have it both ways.
In the application form the paragraph which refers to parking states that the applicants cannot park in the current garage. This is factually incorrect as the previous 2 occupants of the property were able to easily park vehicles in the garage. It may be that the applicants cannot park their large SUV in the current garage but they could park a standard size car in the current garage with ease. I agree with the Design and Access Statement paragraph 6 that the garage is discordant in the street scene but this does not mean that a 2 storey replacement is necessary or desirable for the current garage.
To sum up. This new application is not substantially different from the withdrawn application and is actually worse. The applicant is seeking to use emotional (rather than purely factual) language to support and influence the decision. Please ignore this when considering the application.
Please refuse this application.

Yours Sincerely

Tom Burch

Kind regards