Debbie Johnson

From:	Planning
Sent:	16 May 2014 17:05
To:	Planning
Subject:	Application Comments for AWDM/0447/14

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

Comments were submitted at 5:04 PM on 16 May 2014 from Mr Richard Shirley.

Application Summary

Address:	12 East Meadway Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RF
Proposal:	Removal of existing pitched roof and first floor within. Extension to front (south) elevation and addition of two new storeys to provide first and second floor accommodation including internal alterations to form new side entrance.
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Richard Shirley
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	39 The Malinespike Shoreham-by-Sea

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Although my property does not border 12 East Meadway, the proposed development will have a negative effect on my home and the area in which I live. In making my objections my aim is to support my near neighbours. I purchased my property in 2005 from my mother-in-law, who had owned it since the early 1970's. Prior to my purchase she had sought permission to carry out a loft conversion. In initial discussions with Adur Planning she was told that planning permission would be refused due to overlooking of the pair of semi-detached houses at the bottom of her garden. She was able to produce a photograph showing that prior to the building of these properties, her rear garden and living space were not overlooked. She also maintained that she had raised an objection regarding overlooking. Adur planners relented and planning permission was granted. There were restrictions on the size of the dormers and Velux windows (to the east facing rear roof) were positioned at

such a height as to preclude overlooking, without recourse to step ladders. Currently only gulls and Google Earth can see into my bedroom. I note that the planning permission in respect of the rear extension to 35 The Marlinespike also had restrictions on the position of Velux windows. The proposed development of 12 East Meadway will overlook the garden and living space of 35 The Marlinespike and will also allow a view into my bedroom, without the need for step ladders or the like. Bearing in mind that the owners of both 35 and 39 The Marlinespike have had their proposals and aspirations restricted in scale due to perceived problems with overlooking, the proposals for the three-storey "box on a box on a box" development of 12 East Meadway should be rejected. I confirm our telephone conversation of 12 May that the adjacent property is not three-storey. In looking at previous planning decisions I note that proposals to move forward the gable end on the front elevation at 35 The Marlinespike were rejected on the grounds that "the proposed front extension would result in ... and increasing the prominence of the dwelling, making it more dominant in the street and harmful to the character of the area". Surely the same can be said for the proposals for 12 East Meadway.