Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0036/17

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 18 February 2017 at 10:03
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 10:08 AM on 18 Feb 2017 from Mr Ben Stride.

Application Summary

Address:	175 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HL
Proposal:	Part single and part two-storey rear extension to north elevation (facing Forthaven) and extension to existing 2.1m high boundary wall along northern boundary.
Case Officer:	Eve Hearsey

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Ben Stride
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	179 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5HL

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking
Comments:	Although I have no objections in principal to this application I do wish to make comments on it. My main concern is that the two storey element of the proposal is being proposed on the 'wrong' side of the property. The principle of the two storey extension for this block of properties (Nos. 173 to 181) has already been established with both the adjoining property 177, and also 181 having two storey rear extensions constructed in the past. However, these have both been built on the western side of the properties, hence establishing a precedent for this work. In fact we have also had plans drawn up for a two storey rear extension on the west side of our property following this established pattern. By now proposing the two storey element on the eastern side this goes against this established pattern, and will lead to a lack of visual separation to the rear of these houses. This is important given that both the fronts and rears of these houses face directly onto the public highway and are hence very visible in the street scene. An east side two storey element will also lead to a terracing effect here and does not provide sufficient separation from the two storey element of 177. I feel that the close proximity of these two storey

elements also leads to an overbearing effect to the rear. From looking at the internal layout plans I can see no reason why the two storey element can't be constructed on the western side of the property which would alleviate all of my concerns. This would replicate both 177 and 181 and would be, in my opinion, a far better solution. The master bedroom suite / second storey element of 177 is in this location so there is no reason why it can't be accommodated.

The rear roof terrace as proposed will cause overlooking to the rear garden of 173 Old Fort Road, 177 Old Fort Road and also to 235 Harbour Way, which is on the corner at the junction with Forthaven. In fact the provision of the rear roof terrace will, due to the layout of the properties, remove all privacy from the rear garden of 235 Harbour Way. I would suggest that the application would be more acceptable if this rear roof terrace were deleted from the proposals. However, if a rear roof terrace is deemed acceptable by the planning authority then suitable privacy screens must be provided.

As the garage is to be demolished and a new infill rear wall is to be provided a condition must be added requiring that the redundant vehicle crossing and dropped kerb be removed from Forthaven and the footway here be reinstated.

The existing eastern wall of the garage currently forms the boundary wall between 175 and 177. It is not shown whether this wall will remain, be replaced or a fence provided? Could the applicant please confirm the boundary treatment being proposed here please?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals.