[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 November 2010 08:28
To: Dawn Ayres
Subject: FW:Representation on Planning Application Ref; ADC/0320/10
Attachments: Planning Letter.docx

Dawn

I've tried 3 times to print the attached letter without success – please can you try or, if unsuccessful, seek help from IT.

Thanks, Keith

Keith Morgan - Planning Services Manager | Planning, Regeneration & Wellbeing,
Adur District Council
Location: Civic Centre, Ham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 6PR
Internal: 63239 | External: 01273 263239 | E-mail: keith.morgan@adur.gov.uk

Please think before you print this and save paper

From: david rae-clarke [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: 03 November 2010 19:36
[redacted]
Subject: FW: Planning Application Ref; ADC/0320/10

Ladies and Gentleman of the Planning Committe please find attached our comments on the application for a pitched roof garden store at the rear end of No. 69 Adur Avenue (amended) which we understand will be put before the Planning Committee on Monday 8th November.

We reside at No. 67 Adur Avenue and hope you will take our comments into consideration.

We have today spoken to Counsellor Brian Coomber who suggested a site visit at No. 67 Adur Avenue on Friday 5th November at 14:00 I look forward to seeing you then.

Many thanks

David and Claire Rae-Clarke

Mr. & Mrs. D. Rae-Clarke
67 Adur Avenue
Shoreham
BN43 5NL
Tel: [redacted]

Development Management
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham By Sea
West Sussex
BN43 6PR

1st November, 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

Your Reference: ACD/0320/10
Proposed Pitched Roof Garden Store at end of rear garden (Part Retrospective)
Amended Plans received reducing height of building
69 Adur Avenue, Shoreham

Further to your letter dated 4th October regarding the amended plans to the proposed pitched room garden store at 69 Adur Avenue our comments to you dated 22nd September remain the same.

We would however like to add that on the amended plans, reducing the height of the pitched roof by 0.5 meter will have little effect on the design and appearance of the proposed pitched roof garden store as it will still block out natural sunlight to the bottom of our garden. Furthermore the footprint remains the same which will still be 565mm from our boundary wall – less than the 2 metres specified in 'outbuildings near boundaries' for buildings over 2.5mtrs in height, that was included along with our original letter of the 27/9/ , which was taken from the current guidelines planning portal found on the Council website.

I would also like to comment on the letter submitted by the Planning Officers Report to Committee 8 Nov 2010, dated 27/10/10.

There are several points that I have taken from his letter that I would like to query with the amendment to the proposed pitched roof garden store at No. 69 Adur Avenue.

Visual amenity: Quote

"The store is not visible from the road or any public place and can only be seen from the neighbouring dwellings. It sits at the end of the garden, approximately 14-18m from the back of the neighbouring dwellings in Adur Avenue and 11m from those in Frampton Place. There are a number of trees in the garden of No.69 which help to partly screen the building, particularly from No.67 to the east, and it is considered that the reduction in the height of the building, together with the alterations to the roof design, will help to reduce the bulk and prominence of the building further".

- The store can be observed from the public foothpath on Adur Avenue, between houses 69 & 71.
- There is currently one Cherry Tree to the West Boundry Wall of 69 Adur Avenue adjoining No. 71 which may give some protection to the construction. However there is one Cherry Tree to the East Boundary Wall adjoining No. 67 which does not screen the construction what so ever.

Residential amenity: Qoute

"The building, being at the end of the garden, is not considered to result in any harm to residential amenity. Its position does not cause any loss of light or outlook to neighbouring occupiers in Adur Avenue. Furthermore, there is no storage space or windows within the roofspace that could result in overlooking of adjoining gardens. The eaves height, at 2.2m, is just higher than that of the boundary fence and, with the roof height reduced, it is not considered that refusal of the application on grounds that the building is intrusive or harmful to amenity is justified"

- The current siting of the building certianly does impact on the light allowed into the lower half of our garden,some 30% of the garden is in shadow due to the current shell of the structure, upon completion this will throw the botton half of the garden into total shadow.
- The boundry fence in question backs on to Frampton Place and a 2 mtr high fence seperates the adjoining property of 69 Adur Avenue & 71 Adur Avenue. There is no fencing other than a 1 metre high boundary wall separating No.69 and No.67 Adur Avenue.

- I have enclosed a photograph that was submitted along with our original response on the 27/9/10, which will show the current view of the construction as it appears at the bottom right hand side of our garden which clearly shows no boundary fencing other than as mentioned above.

Planning Assessment
Policies

Policy AH7 refers to residential extensions but the principles are similar when considering ancillary outbuildings. It states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general. The proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive. Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

- I consider the current proposed construction falls somewhat outside the current criteria as per the above statement.


We still consider that the design and appearance of the pitched roof garden store to be invasive, intrusive, out of character with the area and also an overdevelopment of a residential garden/property

We therefore request the council to reject the amended retrospective planning permission for the Pitched Roof Garden Store.

Should the case officer with to come and view/discuss the proposed pitched roof garden store we would be more than happy to accommodate this

Yours faithfully,

David and Claire Rae-Clarke



Existing distance from side of Pitched roof garden store 69 Adur Avenue

565mm (22.25"))

Boundary Wall 67 Adur Avenue

