From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 September 2024 12:22:07 UTC+01:00
To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1080/24

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 04/09/2024 12:22 PM from Mr Barry Nason.

Application Summary

Address:	33A Ham Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2QU
Proposal:	Loft conversion includng rear dormer with Juliet balcony at second floor level and front roof lights; first floor rear balcony
Case Officer:	Finlay Gardner

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Barry Nason
Address:	33 Ham Road, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 2QU

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	To whom it may concern, I am writing to formally object to the planning application submitted by Christina Tate 33A Ham Road for the construction of a first floor balcony on top of our kitchen extension at 33 Ham Road. Our objections are based on the following significant

concerns:

1. Loss of Privacy: The proposed balcony would result in a severe loss of privacy for our household. The elevated position would directly overlook our garden which is currently private. This invasion of privacy would significantly diminish the enjoyment of our home and garden, which was one of the key reasons we purchased the property.

2. Encroachment Over Boundary Lines: According to our HM Land Registry Plan (Title number WSX390153), the proposed balcony would extend beyond the boundary lines of our property. This encroachment is unacceptable and would constitute a clear violation of our property rights. The balcony should not extend over or into any area not owned by the applicant.

3. Structural Concerns: The existing extension was constructed as a single-story structure, with no intention or design to support additional load-bearing features such as a balcony. Adding a balcony would likely require extensive structural modifications, which could compromise the integrity of the extension and pose potential safety risks.

4. Character of the Property: The introduction of a balcony would be out of character with the existing architecture of our property and the surrounding homes, most of which do not feature such additions. This alteration could detract from the overall aesthetic harmony of the neighbourhood.

5. Noise and Disturbance: A balcony above our home would likely lead to increased noise and disturbance, particularly during evenings and weekends. This could adversely affect our quality of life, as we value the current peaceful nature of our surroundings.

6. Potential Overdevelopment: Given that the extension was approved and constructed as a single-story addition, the inclusion of a balcony would constitute an overdevelopment of the site. The balcony would exacerbate the density of use in an already limited space, which could negatively impact both our property and the surrounding area.

7. Negative Impact on Property Value: The loss of privacy and potential noise disturbance associated with the proposed balcony would likely reduce the market value of our property. The decrease in privacy and the intrusive nature of the balcony would make our home less attractive to future buyers, potentially affecting the resale value.

In light of these concerns, I strongly urge the planning authority to reject this application. We believe that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on our property, our privacy, the character of the neighbourhood, and the legal boundaries as

defined in our title deed.

Thank you for considering our objection.

Yours sincerely,

Barry Nason
Rachel Rudat

Kind regards