Hannah Barker
Development Management Section
Adur & Worthing Councils
44 Richmond Road Worthing
Worthing
BN11 1HS

1 Cypress Close
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 6AE

18 July 2019

ADUR & WORTHING
19 JUL 2019
PLANNING SERVICES

Reference: AWDM/1048/19
Planning application for 2 Cypress Close, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 6AE

Dear Ms Barker

I am writing to voice my concerns over the above planning application. Enclosed is a letter setting out my reasons in accordance with your policy on commenting on planning applications.

Yours Sincerely

[redacted]

Pamela Croucher

Hannah Barker
Development Management Section
Adur & Worthing Councils
44 Richmond Road Worthing
Worthing
BN11 1HS

Reference: AWDM/1048/19
Planning application for 2 Cypress Close, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 6AE

My concerns over the above planning application in accordance with your policy on commenting on planning applications are as follows.

1. **Design, appearance, materials, over-all look**
   a. The architectural plan for the proposed remodelling of No. 2 Cypress Close shows a building greatly increased in size from the existing bungalow. Not only will its ground footprint more than double in size, it will also go from one to two storeys. Going from a six room single storey building to a 13 room house, this huge increase in size will result in a building that dwarfs the neighbouring bungalows on what is a very modest sized plot of land.

   b. The line of properties from Nos. 1 to 5 Cypress Close currently all have the same ridgeline, giving a consistent, low level appearance to the north side of the close. As the close is on a hill and the north side is higher than the south, this prevents any one property from forming a dominating position and becoming overbearing and oppressive to the other properties. There are two storey houses within the close but these are all on the east side and their original design and planning means no one building dominates the other. The proposals for No. 2 would be out of character.

   c. No mention is made of the building materials, surely these details are essential when deciding if a new house is suitable for an area and should be made available to planning and all the neighbours notified?

2. **Overlooking, loss of privacy and light**
   a. My property, No. 1 Cypress Close, sits roughly south south east of No. 2 – in effect sitting in front of it, meaning the back of my house and back garden will be overlooked by the proposed development, resulting in a loss of privacy. No. 2 already occupies a position that is elevated by approximately one metre in relation to my bungalow, due to the slope of the hill. Adding another storey would greatly reduce my privacy and I would be directly overlooked by a Juliet balcony on the first floor and also indirectly overlooked by three other first floor windows to the west of the building.

3. **Highway safety, traffic and parking**

a. The amount of off road parking is not detailed on the plans, but there appears to be less, not more provision for vehicles. I would expect residents of a large five bedroom house to have a need for more vehicles than a two bedroom bungalow. I therefore consider parking and access will be a major problem that would affect not only the immediate neighbours, but have a knock-on affect to the close as a whole.

b. The property sits at the end of the close, at a point that must be kept clear to allow vehicles to turn and allow access to the property itself. Because the property adjoins the road only via a cross over, parking outside the property is impossible. I would be extremely concerned that parking and congestion would become a serious issue if the plans were approved.

c. The close is already a bottleneck and the anticipated increase in vehicles from this size of property can only add to this. Access for emergency and council vehicles could be a problem if there is insufficient provision for off road parking. Refuse vehicles need the full cul de sac space to turn around, as do most vehicles visiting residents. An inability to turn round would mean drivers reversing out of the close around a long, winding road, which would be dangerous.

4. **Noise, disturbance, traffic and smells**

a. Difficult access to the site, in combination with the size of the proposed property, means the timescale for development is likely to be long – many months if not one or two years judging from other building projects I have witnessed. The disturbance, disruption and noise that this would cause over a long period of time, only a few metres from my home, would cause me great distress.

b. Our central green is a lovely tree-filled, shared space that is currently a nice, safe space for children to play. I am concerned that with difficult access to the property, it will be 'easier' to leave demolition rubble and construction materials on it. It also requires protection from damage by vehicles and equipment used in the construction.

c. My front gate is next to the entrance to No. 2 and being elderly and less mobile I fear discarded building materials causing a trip hazard and blocking the entrance to my property.

Finally, I believe the proposed remodelling of the original building is actually a complete redevelopment, as virtually nothing of the existing structure, inside or out, will remain. These extensions will result in an over development of the site and a house totally out of keeping with its neighbourhood.