Comments on Planning Application - AWDM/1105/20

1 message

Dave Ludkin [redacted] 27 July 2020 at 11:38
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

YOUR REF – AWDM/1105/20 – Planning application for rear extension to 11 Mill Hill Gardens BN435TN

Dear Planning Office,

I am writing to make some comments and objections to the planning application made for an extension to my neighbours rear elevation.

The comments are summarised into three areas:-

1/ Daylight

2/ Appearance

3/ Loss of Amenity

The proposed extension is excessive in scale and will dominate the rear of the property. On inspecting the plans it is clearly evident that the proposed extension will project some 5.5m from the rear of the property.

The immediate outlook from my dining area to the left will have 2.5m of solid brick wall, which will be extremely oppressive and cause loss of residential amenity.

Noting the plans I also query the 45% ruling here.

Two reasons;

A) the note on the drawing is based on assumption as I have not shared scale drawings of the back of my property.

B) I have not received nor agreed to any survey of the back of my property to allow an accurate interpretation of this ruling.

Due to the above I believe the note on the drawing to be mis-leading until such time as it is proven.

Additionally, due to the proximity of the proposed structure, I also query the 45% rule in elevation, this is not noted on the drawings and as the sun rises to the east there will clearly be a detrimental reduction in light.

The above, I believe to have a clear detrimental effect on residential amenity as per section 2.2 of the Adur & Worthing development management standard No.2 (Extensions and alterations to dwellings).

The appearance and size of the proposed extension are also of concern.

As noted earlier, the proposal projects some 5.5m out from the back of the property; not only is this out of scale with the size of the bungalow (ref section 2.5 of the management standard) it also far exceeds the maximum advised depth of 3.5m as noted in section 3.5 of the development management standards quoted below.

“On semi-detached or terraced dwellings single-storey rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper that 3.5m”

The proposed extension clearly abuts the common side boundary.

The extension to my property is at the 3.5m recommended maximum, I mention this as the application clearly states that my property has a “large extension” when in fact it meets the development management standards.

I strongly feel that the proposal in question does not meet the correct standards as laid out within the Adur & Worthing Development Management Standard no.2 and object to it on the grounds noted above.

Regards,

David Ludkin

12 Mill Hill Gardens

Sent from Mail for Windows 10