Gmail by Google

Debbie Johnson <debbie.johnson@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION REF AWDM/1790/15 FROM THE OWNER OF 53 THE CRESCENT

1 message

Kim Bown <[redacted] 7 January 2016 at 17:14
To: debbie.johnson@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Your Ref: AWDM/1790/15

7th January 2016

For the attention of the Planning Services Manager
planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Dear Mr Peck

Re: Proposed extension to 55 The Crescent

Further to your letter received 21st December 2015, with regards to my neighbour's above planning application, I would like to convey my strong objection to the proposal for the following reasons:-

I believe that the proposed extension, taking into account the extremity of height and length directly adjacent to the boundary of my property, would affect my enjoyment of my property due to the impact on light and outlook because:

- The size, design and location would result in an extension which would be dominant and overbearing, creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure to my house; a feeling of being hemmed in.
- Light would be blocked out to the right hand side ground floor of my property due to the height of the proposed extension.
- Light would be blocked out to a large area of my garden due to the length and height of the proposed extension.

Difference in Land Levels of Properties no 53 and 55

The difference in land levels of the two properties would further increase the dominant, overshadowing and claustrophobic issues mentioned above.

The Crescent is a road which is on a clearly visible uphill slope which runs upwards from Manor Hall Road to Hadrian Avenue. Number 55 is on a higher ground level than my property, as can easily be viewed from both the front and rear of both properties. I request that the changes in levels between the two properties and the gardens are taken into account. Looking out on to my garden, it rises to it's highest line, length wise, along the far right where the boundary is to number 55.

Boundary

To the best of my knowledge, I understand that extensions within one metre of the boundary will normally be limited to a maximum of 3.5 metres in length, and for every additional metre from the boundary this can be increased by one metre. Bearing this in mind, along with my above issues, I request that an extension of a more reasonable distance from my boundary be considered.

Boundary Wall

There is a boundary brick wall of approximately 6ft long joined onto the rear of my neighbour's property. I can see no mention of this wall on the extension application. I would advise that this wall requires attention prior to any extension being built in front of it, whilst there is still easy access to repair or replace it, prior to it becoming unsafe. It is currently cracked in few areas and leaning slightly at the top, and although currently safe, I think it will further deteriorate.

Trees

It states on the application form that the coniferous trees marked T3 at number 55 are well pruned and not within falling distance to the proposed extension. I think this should be clarified by a third party as in my opinion they appear to have grown into very dense, tall and unshaped conifers. All seven trees appear to be of a similar height, being the same height as the top of number 55's chimney. Hence, why I believe the falling distance needs clarifying, at least where the end two trees are concerned which are nearest to my property and the proposed extension.

Location Plan and Block Plan

Please note that the block and location plans submitted with the application are pre extension plans of my property from past years. However, I understand that you do have more recent plans and an aerial view to hand showing my back right hand ground floor window and windowed door.

I would greatly appreciate you carefully considering my above concerns.

Yours faithfully

Kim Bown (Mrs)