Attn: Marie O'Keeffe (Case Officer)

Dear Sir/Madam

Objection to Application for Prior Approval Ref. NOTICE 0020/24

206 Harbour Way, Shoreham by Sea

As the owner and occupier of no 208 Harbour Way, I am writing to formally object to the application for Prior Approval referenced above for the proposed development at 206 Harbour Way Shoreham by Sea BN435HZ. I am extremely concerned that the proposal will have negative consequences not only for our own property but also for the community living in the immediate vicinity for the following reasons.

1. Appearance

The property is part of a group of 20 properties built in a contiguous curve all at the same height and with the same appearance. Adding another storey of at least 2.8 metres to one property only, as is proposed, is drastically out of place and will create a jarring visual effect. In the locality there is a regularity of buildings with regard to their height with which this proposal will clash and I believe it will significantly detract from the view of this part of the area.

Although this is an application for Prior Approval and not Planning Permission, in reality the tests that must be satisfied are little different. The 2015 Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, Schedule 2 para AA.2 reminds us that the Local Planning Authority still has to be satisfied on the following matter

(a)before beginning the development, the developer must apply to the local planning authority for prior approval as to—

(i)impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light

(ii)the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of

(aa)the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and

(bb)any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway

The proposed one full storey increase will stand incongruously above the rest of the development and will be clearly visible through the gap from Harbour Way next to no 170 and then from the front of almost the entire development of 192 -224 Harbour Way. Not only that but the proposal will also be seen by residents from the eastern end of The Moorings and even from some locations in Falcon Close. Its impact will be unrelieved as it will be seen against the sky from all points with no background development to soften or help absorb it into the townscape.

This proposal fails the tests of para 135 of the NPPF because it does not add to the overall quality of the area, it is not visually attractive, nor is it sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Adur Council's Development Management Standard No 2 – Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings is a more detailed design document that reflects Policy 15 of the Local Plan – Quality of the built Environment and Public Realm. It states that proposals will not be granted permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. This could be for reasons of privacy, daylight or outlook, and the advice notes that the impact of extensions to terraced and semi-detached properties is likely to be greater. The advice continues

'The most important basic 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'

In fact, although the type of roof extension proposed is not specifically addressed in the advice, its impact and lack of sympathy with its surroundings will be very similar to the 'unacceptable dormers' depicted at para 12, except on a much wider scale.

The Shoreham Beach Neighbourhood Plan is still evolving, and particularly noteworthy under Policy NR1 – High Quality, Neighbourly Design – is that proposals for development will be expected to, amongst other things,

'NR 1.2 respect the rhythm and pattern of buildings and street frontages, while ensuring that

any new, higher density developments incorporate appropriate measures to allow for a smooth transition from existing lower density development, to ensure that they assimilate well into the street scene.'

2. Construction and risk to neighbouring properties

The 20 properties were built more than 50 years ago, and I understand they are constructed on a concrete raft on the shingle bed that makes up Shoreham Beach. The use of heavy machinery in the construction including a crane can and will create vibrations that may crack walls and ceilings inside my property and outside may cause problems with the foundations on the concrete raft and to our roof. The roof is a particular concern for the following reasons

The construction is on asphalt on timber and needs regular upkeep. It is contiguous across the 20 properties to the extent that, in the past, damage to a roof has led to ingress of water and damage in a neighbouring property and that led to serious arguments and upset between owners (at 212 Harbour Way though the owners have moved since). Both the roof at 208 and at 204 Harbour Way have suffered damage requiring two complete roof replacements at 204 and insurance claims and roof repairs at 208 in the past. While the roof construction is firm when undisturbed, it is not robust, and residents have to be very careful when any roof work is needed. It is clear that the construction proposed would involve heavy machinery and access for the builders and it seems inevitable that they will need to be on **our roof** when building the neighbouring wall. This is very worrying given our knowledge of the history of damage to our roof. (this is not a criticism of the builders just an inevitable risk).

The wall between the two properties was built to support a light roof. I have concerns that the wall was not designed to safely support another storey.

Our two skylights on the roof are permanently open to the air to ensure the bathroom and house do not become too damp. If the construction goes ahead dust and fine debris will also be a problem.

3. Unneighbourliness

Noise in the construction phase would be temporarily troublesome. However, the scheme leaves two balconies extremely close to our bedrooms. People standing on the balconies

would be approximately 3 metres away from our bedroom windows so that private conversations would be hard not to overhear (both ours and our neighbours). This would result in a loss of privacy and in unintentional disturbance to sleep when conversations take place on the balconies in the evening.

This is a serious concern not just for us as the most immediately affected but from the proposed rear balcony it seems likely that most of the rear gardens of 192-224 Harbour Way would be overlooked as well as 1 and 2 The Moorings, and I note no 1 The Moorings has already submitted an objection.

To summarise, as explained we have our own concerns as immediate neighbours, but this is a proposal that will have a wider adverse community impact. If this application is approved, it will inevitably encourage other similar proposals that will be more difficult to resist. The result could be a random pepper potting of roof extensions whose appearance will be entirely at odds with the smooth rhythm of the present roof profile intended when this development was constructed.

I respectfully ask that you consider the objections I have raised as significant factors in your decision-making process for this application. I believe the points I have set out demonstrate that it is not in the public interest and the adverse effects on ourselves and many of our neighbours will substantially outweigh any individual benefit to the applicant.

Thank you for considering my objections. I look forward to your response.

Yours faithfully,

Dr G T Cairns BA

Mrs C M Cairns BA