Gmail by Google

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1454/19

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 6 October 2019 at 11:27
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 11:36 AM on 06 Oct 2019 from Mrs Elaine Margott.

Application Summary

Address: 2 Cypress Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6AE

Proposal: Amended plans received showing details of works to be completed under Permitted Development. Single storey rear/side (West and North) extension, side facing dormer (West) with 2no. rooflights and South facing first floor window. (East facing dormer and additional west facing dormer to be constructed under permitted development.)

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Elaine Margott

Email: [redacted]

Address: 3 Cypress Close, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6AE

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments:
Hannah Barker
Development Management Section
Adur & Worthing Councils
Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing
BN11 1HS

5/10/19
OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION
Your Reference: AWDM/1454/19 Date: 13/09/2019
Ref: AWDM/1454/19 "Amended Plan" Date: 25/9/2019
2 Cypress Close, Shoreham-By-Sea BN43 6AE

We are writing to object to the above planning application. In doing so we refer to our letter dated

4/10/19 where we object that the existing "Amended Plan" and description are still incomplete and ask you to note that we are disadvantaged because of this as no doubt the developer intended. We also state why we believe "Permitted Development" is not applicable.
We have quoted below the Adur District Development Management Standard No.2. (Clauses quoted in brackets). We are objecting on the following grounds:

Planning Principles and the effect on neighbouring properties (1.9) (2.1) (2.2.)

1. The "Amended Plan" now includes two large dormers out to the external walls and this has the similar affect to the first plan (AWDM/1048/19) of being oppressive and completely overbearing the adjacent properties No.1 and No.3 Cypress Close. In particular because the dormers would be unacceptably close. From the front of the property the dormers form a box like appearance out of keeping with the prevailing character of the close, being detrimental to the dwelling itself and negatively effecting the residential and visual amenity.

2. Loss of Daylight/SunLight (2.2) (3.7) Our kitchen window (principle) is the only window on our west face. The window is only 5.4meters from No.2 Cypress Close's east external wall and the existing property already blocks much light. The large size of the proposed three room dormer would block further light from the south and north to our only window and crucially, because our kitchen (principle) window is aligned centre, the height and closeness of the proposed dormer would cause maximum further loss of light. Similarly the dormer would have the same effects on loss of sunlight to our garden and kitchen which causes us great concern.

3. Loss of Privacy (2.2)(3.4)- Our garden and patio is to the west and north of our property. We are shocked to find that should it be allowed, the 1st floor window of Bedroom 2, being clear glazed would be overhead and less than 4 meters from our garden seating area. This window would OVERLOOK THE WHOLE OF OUR GARDEN and patio. It is no exaggeration to say that there would be nowhere we would not be overlooked. We cannot express the affect this would have on our lifestyle and privacy, being keen gardeners, in our retirement our garden is our haven. From the plan it appears that the other large (frosted?) windows in the dormer would be able to be opened looking directly into our kitchen below and together with the intimidating building potentially overshadowing and dominating our property, this really is an unreasonable and unacceptable loss of privacy.

4. Appearance (3.8) - Adur policy states (2.5) the most important principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. The double dormer full box like appearance dominates No.1 Cypress close and that side of the central green and street. The property is

also approached uphill and the road curves up so that the east face of the property with the large Dormer is the dominating feature as you approach the property, over-dominating the house and the street scene generally.

5. Materials - We note that materials used can affect the above headings but are not included in the description or plan and is a concern to us. We request details are shared with us.

6. Garage - The plan and description does not clarify if the existing garage is being demolished or being kept. The existing garage wall forms part of the boundary to 3 Cypress Close, and 10 & 11 Downside close. And residents may have questions or objections that would be raised once clarified. The likely demolishing of the garage will further increase the loss of privacy as described in "3"above.

7. Parking and Access
Parking and turning space - There will be no turning space on the development for vehicles and the position of the entrance to the property at the end of the road means it is likely that this needs to be considered carefully. Parking is already very limited in the close.
It should be noted that the council refuse vehicles need the full cul- de- sac space to enter and turn around as do the majority of vehicles entering the close. This needs to be considered and the road managed closely during the building works.

Access- the very limited access to the site and the closeness of the neighbouring property entrances means the proposal will have a much bigger impact than typical on the two closest properties in particular but the whole road too. For this reason the construction works need to be closely managed and the effects of the construction works and timescale considered as there is just no room for large construction and delivery vehicles excepting the actual drive entrance.

8. Greenspace -Protection from damage of our central green and trees is a previously expressed concern from all residents of the close. Recent experiences show that the limited access led to trade vehicles being parked or driven across this green and a particular risk to the children playing there.

Lastly we feel that only by visiting Cypress Close, and our property No. 3 Cypress Close can the issues of appearance, loss of daylight/sunlight and particularly Loss of Privacy be fully understood and considered. We therefore request that the planning committee visit as soon as practicable so they can judge the planning application fully informed.

Yours sincerely

Elaine & Paul Margott,
3 Cypress Close, Shoreham by Sea BN43 6AE