Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1391/20

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 29 September 2020 at 17:35
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 5:35 PM on 29 Sep 2020 from Mr Nigel Derham.

Application Summary

Address: 22 Downside Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HG

Proposal: Proposed replacement garage to rear garden (existing garage already removed)

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Nigel Derham

Address: 2 Tottington Way, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6HU

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Loss of General Amenity
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments:

1) Following the 2 previous planning applications being rejected I am nervous that this structure is being built with a view to a later application for consent to convert to dwelling.

2)There are errors and omissions on the drawings. The buildings on the site are incorrectly shown. The street plan although welcome is still misleading i.e ridge height is 4.2-4.3m height in the drg (see below). I think it unfair that the council is being asked to make an assessment on clearly incorrect information.

3)No dimensions from property boundaries. Ridge height is missing. Transposing the digitised drg the ridge height is between 5,2meters and 5.3meters height.
Block plan does not show up to date development.

4)The size is excessive. Garage is visually intrusive and will change the character of the road and result in loss of light.

5)The garage does not follow the building line.

6) Sets a precedent.

7) "(existing garage already removed)" this is clearly

not the case as shown in previous planning applications .There was a small greenhouse in this area of the garden. The existing garage is still in existence and a metal shed has been built upon it.

In summary I can see no evidence of any material changes, which would render the council's original decision, which I wholly support, as invalid. I believe that you should return the same response, as it is essentially the same application.

Many Thanks

Nigel Derham