Gmail by Google

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

Fwd: 24 Ring Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0QE - AWDM/1825/18

1 message

Debbie Johnson <debbie.johnson@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 19 March 2019 at 12:49
To: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: [redacted]
Date: Sun, 17 Feb 2019 at 17:39
Subject: Re: 24 Ring Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0QE - AWDM/1825/18
To: Hannah Barker <hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Hannah

Thank you for your email of Tuesday 12th February attaching revised plans (AWDM/1825/18 and alternative reference PP-07445934). Please be aware that we have deliberately not responded to you until now because we are aware that you only work two days a week and do not want to clog your mailbox.

You state in the email that 'the proposals amended'… 'meet the concerns originally set out in relation to residential and visual amenity' but this is in fact not the case as they only address 2 of the 10 concerns raised and now create further concerns.

You state in your email that 'the set in allows the extension to meet the Council's Management Space Standards' however it is clearly flaunting your guidelines as it is in fact a two storey increase with no (1 metre) gap as recommended buy your guidelines. This appears to therefore be accepting of the fact that access to maintain any part of the boundary / party wall or the proposed extensions by the applicants is acceptable too. This would therefore mean that the applicants would have the right of access to our property and land at any point in time as they would not have sufficient space to maintain their own property within their own land / plot. This is utterly objectionable as it would be a large imposition upon our privacy. As you are most likely aware the right of access is a law and not a guideline and so would be granting the applicant more freedom than would be acceptable in any circumstance.

You state in that email that we will be sent a letter for information, to date nothing has arrived.

It has also come to light that there are rules surrounding what is permissible in terms of extensions and that you cannot cover more than 50% of the land around your house with extensions (including extensions by previous owners), and you have to include any outbuildings when calculating this coverage. Sheds and other outbuildings count in this calculation. We ask that you confirm to us if this rule applies in this instance as we believe that the additions will form a greater amount than 50% of the original structure but may be misinterpreting this?

We object to the revised plans as uploaded to your website for the following reasons:

Single storey rear (east) extension

Whilst this extension is acceptable when considered separately, when read in conjunction with the overall plan, specifically where it adjoins the north side extension, the width of the build is not within the council guideline of a one metre gap for a building above a single storey. The overall plan is fact an extension of three storeys, ground floor, first floor and loft to create a new second floor that currently does not exist.

First floor (north) extension

It has obviously been assumed that we only object to this in part and for the avoidance of doubt we now confirm that **we object to the north side extension in its entirety and the raising of the roof**. We reiterate that we agree with the decision made regarding planning application ADC/0137/06 and that it is still entirely relevant.

We comment and object to the current revised plan as follows below:

1 – The revised plan (application ADC/0137/06) plan showing a 1 metre gap on the boundary was agreed however the owners of No.24 decided to follow a different plan, which I cannot see on the only Council website and may or may not have been done as permitted development. This involved demolishing the existing utility room and extending a single storey north up to the boundary, similar to the originally rejected plans. The roof gutter of this first floor extension is directly above the boundary wall between our properties and the proposed plan is following this line. There are 4 openings along this but it is not clear if these were ever approved or were accepted as a part of permitted development.

2 – The revised plan would still have an "unduly cramped appearance which would detract from the character of the surrounding residential environment". The closeness to properties on the north and south will create a 'terracing' effect which does not fit with the character of the road's individually designed **Detached** architect homes – note that the south side of No.24 is already built up to the adjoining boundary wall with No.22, this means that it would fill the entire plot width with no 1 metre gap on either the north or south side of the property, this does not fit in any way with any other extended property in Ring Road and is therefore utterly objectionable.

3 – The addition of a new second storey, increased roof area, change in roof pitch and increased roof height would significantly reduce the natural light and would overshadow and impose upon No.26. The revised plan with 1 metre inset would not reduce this impact in any way and natural light will be removed from the kitchen, office, master bedroom, garage roof patio and garden patio (and purposely designed garden seating areas). Natural light is of paramount importance to No.26 as it was a specific design feature due to the plot being orientated East to West and so the house does not get much natural daylight.

The plans show that the roof height is increasing, as is the width however the changes are not fully detailed in the plans although you have indicated to me the height will increase by approx. 68cm, the additional width has not been taken into consideration. It would still impair light to the rooms identified as we showed you when you came for a site visit on Tuesday 22nd January. The revised plan does not lessen the impact on reducing light to the south side of No.26.

We are seeking a formal daylight / sunlight assessment from a chartered surveyor and architectural technologist.

Also note that none of the surrounding properties are two storey buildings and none are extended to the degree that is proposed within this plan.

4 – Whilst you have had the applicants remove a bathroom window on the north extension that would overlook our property you have not commented in your email that as to whether you intend to agree other openings in the north wall. As we have pointed out already, the existing ground floor extension is currently on the boundary and has been built with openings (kitchen extractor, velux window, toilet and boiler ventilation). There is no reason for us to expect that the applicants would once again ignore your ruling with the proposed north extension, despite you documenting any specific decision.

Note rule quoted in in response to planning application ADC/0137/06:

5 – We are very concerned that the additional weight of not 1 but 2 additional storeys to a build that is proposed to have most of its ground floor supporting walls removed undermines the foundations so close to the boundary and would negatively affect the retaining wall between our properties with the potential for subsidence.

6 – Our interpretation of the new plans shows the removal of the rear kitchen wall to be replaced, presumably, with an RSJ spanning two-thirds of the extended house width. This would transfer an increased weight to the boundary wall. Any work to reinforce the foundations on this side may adversely affect the retaining boundary wall and in any case there is insufficient space to allow for this to be done.

7 – The waste water and sewage for No.26, we believe runs underneath the side path to the south of No.26, any additional weight or force upon that area could cause damage to the pipework.

8 – With the closeness to the boundary we do not see how any work to extend the first floor or roof under this revised plan, can be performed successfully without access to our land. As we object to the plans we **DO NOT** grant access to our land for building work. We remain very disappointed that our neighbours have not taken any

opportunity to mention to us their plans as they are obviously aware of the acute impact this application has upon us.

Weatherboard cladding to first floor elevations and extension of first floor

No comment at this time as the plans shows this relating to the **north extension that we object to IN ITS ENTIRETY**.

NB. We note that as per ADC/0137/06, Permission Condition 02

We would like the opportunity to comment if there are any changes to the plan.

West facing balcony with glass/stainless steel balustrade

We have no objection to the replacement of the existing west facing balcony with a glass and stainless steel balustrade under the revised plan as set out in your email. We would however object to any further increase in the future.

Note that Adur District Council's decision letter dated 31st July 2006, re ADC/0137/06 declined the two-storey side extension north side and refers to condition 03 regarding amended plans received on 14th July 2006. These amended plans have still not been made available to us and so we are restricted from making any further comment, however we may wish to and would appreciate it if you will either make a copy available to us or advise where or how we would be able to obtain a copy from?

Sent from Windows Mail