From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 11 June 2022 20:52
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0801/22

Flag Status: Flagged

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 11/06/2022 8:52 PM from Ms Sue Ford.

Application Summary

Address:	18 Longshore Drive Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 6DJ
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension
Case Officer:	Eve Hearsey

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Sue Ford
Address:	16 Longshore Drive, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex BN43 6DJ

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Planning application comments on AWDM/0801/22 Proposed single storey rear extension | 18 Longshore Drive Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 6DJ Where relevant, references in brackets next to our comments refer to the Adur & Worthing Council Development Management Standard document Our neighbours chose not to discuss their proposals for the extension with us before submitting the planning application, despite the guidance suggesting they should do so [1.4].

We were only given a copy of the architect's plans after they had been submitted to the council for planning consideration.

As the neighbouring property to the planning application, we object to the proposed extension in the strongest terms as we believe it will have a severe adverse effect on our current enjoyment of our house and garden. This is the main planning concern at [2.1] of the Development Management Standard document.

The proposed extension will have a substantial detrimental effect on us as the neighbouring property. The main detrimental effects will be as follows:

1. The outlook from our only ground floor living space will be dominated by the extension. The extension is proposed to abut the common side boundary and due to the nature of our narrow house in the centre of the terrace, it will be just 1.5 metres from our only window in the room. [2.2]

2. This negative impact on us is greatest because we are the only terraced house in this row [2.3]

3. At its maximum height the proposed extension will be 3.5 metres tall and it will be 3.5 metres deep. The side wall, which will be just 1.5 metres away from our window will be vast and will dominate our outlook from our living space. This adverse effect is significant because the proposed extension abuts the boundary between our properties. [3.2]

4. Although the planning permission being sought is for a single-story extension, due to the pitched roof a majority of the extension will be in excess of what would be expected of a single-story extension with a flat roof. The sheer height and depth of the extension, in such close proximity to our house and the only window in our only ground floor living space, will be overbearing and oppressive [2.2]

5. The proposed extension is just short of 3.5 metres in length. Although this is within the council's recommendations for a single-story extension, due to the extension abutting the common side boundary, as well as the very narrow nature of our house in the centre of the terrace, the extension extends considerably into the horizonal area which can be marked out by the 45 degree guideline. This is an industry guideline which is often used to determine if an extension is reasonable in size when close to another property. It is measured from the middle of the only window in our downstairs room. Based on this, we have calculated the proposed extension should be no more than 2.6 meters deep.

6. The proposed extension is south-easterly of our house and therefore due to the height, depth and close proximity of the extension there will be a considerable negative impact on the sunlight directly entering the only window in our only ground floor living space. During the winter months (approximately October to March) when the sun is naturally low in the sky, the proposed extension will dramatically reduce, if not totally stop, direct sunlight entering our ground floor room especially during the first half of the day. In the same way, during the winter months the proposed extension will block out the direct sunlight we currently enjoy on the patio area which stretches for just 3 metres from our house.

7. As our house is in the middle of a terrace with no side alleyway or garage to extend the garden to either side, the width of our garden is just 4.5 metres. Therefore the proposed height, length and close proximity of the proposed extension will be over-bearing and oppressive to us when using our narrow garden. With a maximum height of 3.5 meters it will cast low winter shadow over our 4.5-meter-wide patio, there will be a severely negative overall impact on our current enjoyment of our patio and garden, especially in winter.

8. The proposal does not specify the exterior height of the extension's pitched roof at its lowest point. It does state that the interior height will be 2.1 meters, therefore we estimate that the pitched roof will be approximately 2.4 meters high at its lowest point. The Development Management Standard document suggest at paragraph 3.6 that flat rooves are usually acceptable. At an estimated exterior height of 2.4 meters as explained above, this would significantly reduce the negative impact on us, as would a much lower pitched roof.

9. Due to the small gardens and irregular nature of the boundary at the bottom of the gardens, we are unsure whether the garden remaining in 18 Longshore Drive may fall short of the councils recommended rear garden depth of 11 metres following completion of the extension. [2.4]

10. The proposed extension is unpreceded in this central area of the estate. Other houses seeking more room have converted the garage into a work/living space, therefore having no adverse light/sunlight impact on their neighbours.

11. Were this proposal to be granted, presumably others of a similar size could also be successful. If this were to be repeated at number 12 Longshore Drive, we would find ourselves in the position where the ground floor living room & patio of our terraced house were in effect in a 'brick tunnel'

12. We note that a single-story rear extension with a pitched roof has been approved and is currently under construction at number 53 Longshore Drive. However the impact of that extension on its neighbours is less than that proposed at number 18 because

a. That extension is just 2.6 meters deep, the planning case officer described that as being "modest in scale". This matches exactly the calculation we made using the 45 degree guideline referred to in our paragraph 5 above. At 3.5 meters deep, what is being proposed at number 18 is clearly a much larger scale.

b. The neighbouring property most affected has a rear garden approximately 6.5 meters wide, 2 meters wider than ours, so the impact is proportionally much less.

c. Unlike for us, those houses face due south, therefore the impact of any lost sunlight especially in winter is much less.

d. The rear of Numbers 53 & their neighbours face Crown Road, which are 1-storey bungalows and have longer gardens, therefore more light is able to reach the rear of the Longshore properties at all times. Whereas the proposed extension at number 18 is both taller and deeper and in this area of the estate it is surrounded by 2 & 3 storey houses which are built much closer together with short gardens. We do not have the quantity of open light and unbroken outlook enjoyed by the neighbours to number 53's extension.

Kind regards