Dawn Ayres

From: Planning
Sent: 09 November 2011 10:11
To: Dawn Ayres
Subject: FW: Application Comments for AWDM/0666/11
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

FYA

From: Planning
Sent: 08 November 2011 15:19
To: Planning
Subject: Application Comments for AWDM/0666/11

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

Comments were submitted at 3:19 PM on 08 Nov 2011 from Ms Isabel Wall.

Application Summary

Address: 118 Harbour Way Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HH

Proposal: First floor side extension and rear balcony together with repositioned roof lantern

Case Officer: Jo Morin

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Ms Isabel Wall

Email: [redacted]

Address: 116 Harbour Way Shoreham by Sea

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: As the owners of 116 Harbour Way, Shoreham by Sea, we would like to object to the plans for the above residence to build a balcony on the rear extension. We have no objection to any of the other proposed works. 116 and 118 adjoin to make two small semi detached houses. Privacy is difficult to maintain in such a small area. We believe that the proposed balcony on the roof of the extension of 118 would result in: 1. Our garden being

overlooked losing any privacy we have in our garden 2. A loss of privacy to our main bedroom 3. Creating a potential noise disturbance to our main sleeping area in the future. 4. Becoming overbearing and oppressive to our dining and patio area 1. Overlooking and loss of privacy in the garden Please review photographs taken by Jo Morin from the grass area of our garden. We would feel 'watched' by anyone sitting on the balcony while we were out in the garden. 2. A loss of privacy to our main bedroom The proposed balcony is in very close proximity to our main bedroom. Again please review photographs. Despite obscured glass it would feel that anyone using the balcony would be very close to our bedroom especially should we need to open the windows during the summer. 3. Creating a potential noise disturbance to our main sleeping area. While we acknowledge that Mrs Namsoo is unlikely to cause a noise disturbance on the balcony, we fear that future occupiers may not be so considerate should the house be later sold or rented out. Again the close proximity to our bedroom would cause a great deal of anxiety and distress if the balcony was to be mis-used in the future. 4. Becoming overbearing and oppressive to our dining and patio area As the proximity of the balcony is so close to our house, the high obscured glass on top of the rear extension would result in an overbearing and oppressive feeling to our patio and dining areas Although we understand that each planning application is reviewed on a case by case basis, please can we highlight the guidance set out in the Adur District Planning document – Development and Control Standards No 3 Extensions and alterations to dwellings that: 3.22 The addition of a balcony to a property anywhere near the boundary would be likely to lead to problems of overlooking. Balconies on terraced or semi-detached properties will therefore usually be resisted. And to the document Schedule of Model Planning Conditions and Reasons for Refusal C18F Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no part of the roof of the extension hereby permitted shall be converted into or used as a balcony or terrace nor shall any access be formed thereto. Reason: To prevent overlooking and to comply with policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and G5 & B2 of the West Sussex Structure Plan Many thanks for your consideration to our objection. We look forward to your response