Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0713/18

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 10 June 2018 at 19:44
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 7:44 PM on 10 Jun 2018 from Miss Gemma Lewis.

Application Summary

Address: 139 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6TA

Proposal: First storey extension above existing single storey extension to rear (south)

Case Officer: Marie O'Keeffe

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Miss Gemma Lewis

Email: [redacted]

Address: 137 Upper Shoreham Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6TA

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Overdevelopment

Comments: The applicant's supporting statement says that he considers that the proposed development will have less impact upon the locality than the extensions approved under a previous application. However, the rear extension is greater in depth than the previous plans, the existing window is planned to be moved nearer to our property and when you add this to the current loft conversion he is carrying out under permitted development, the total development is likely to have a far greater impact - some would say overdeveloped.

Details on our objections are:

Roof structure
The previous application allowed for a tiled pitched roof, which is in keeping with the neighbouring properties. There are no first floor flat roof structures in the surrounding neighbourhood. A flat roof on a first floor extension of this nature will look ugly and bulky and would be disproportionately out of character with the surrounding area. As well as neighbouring properties, there is a public footpath directly adjacent to the property from which the proposed structure would be clearly noticeable. A pitched roof, as per the previous application, would blend in with the existing skyline. Note that a property in the same row (119) has a first floor rear

extension with pitched roof - which would be much better.

Repositioning of existing window
The application shows intended removal of the existing rear bedroom window from its current location, replacing it with a smaller window almost directly adjacent to the party wall separating our property from the applicant's. Two concerns arise from this. Firstly, it would severely hinder any likelihood for us should we wish to apply for a similar development in the future, and we would not be able to because of the 45 degree rule from his new window. Secondly, the close proximity to the party wall raises the question of sufficient structural support so as not to detriment the stability of the current building.

Whereby we purchased our property as our long term home, the applicant has not ever been or, to the best of our knowledge, intends to be resident in his property, this application appears to be more of a business consideration rather than that of a home owner. They have already maxed out permitted development with the garden outbuilding, ground floor extension and now the current loft conversion - adding another first floor extension is excessive.