Gmail by Google

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

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0402/16

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 5 April 2016 at 17:40
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 5:40 PM on 05 Apr 2016 from Ms Natasha Glover.

Application Summary

Address:	198 Upper Shoreham Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6BG
Proposal:	First-floor rear extension over previously approved single-storey rear extension.
Case Officer:	Matthew Porter

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Natasha Glover
Email:	[redacted]
Address:	196 Upper Shoreham Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6BG

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Ref ADWM/0402/16 198 Upper Shoreham Road BN43 6BG We are writing to submit a formal objection to the above proposed development. Current situation: We reside at 196 Upper Shoreham Road. Our kitchen is at the rear of the property adjacent to the boundary of No 198. The distance between the side walls of the two properties is approximately 2 m. No 198 had a flat roof rear extension measuring 3 m. with a height of approx. 2.5 m. The side window of the kitchen at No 196 faced this extension (at a distance of c2 m – see above) but did not suffer from a loss of light or overbearing effect since the low height of the extension at No 198 allowed adequate natural light and outlook. Proposed development: This is the third application in respect of No198. We objected to Application No

ADWM/1769/15 on the grounds of overbearing and oppressive presence and total loss of outlook. This application was rejected. We did not object to the revised Application AWDM/0144/16 (now approved) since the reduced size of the proposed extension and the lowered height of the proposed eaves met many, if not all, of our concerns. The current application (AWDM/0402/16) proposes a first floor rear extension over the approved single storey extension. The net effect on No 196 would be to completely obliterate light and outlook from the side kitchen window, and to introduce an unacceptable degree of overlooking into the kitchen of No 196 via the proposed new side bedroom window in No 198 and into the garden patio via the window of the proposed bedroom extension. The whole would have an overbearing effect especially when the considerably enlarged replacement of the previous garage at No 198 is taken into account. This significant development is not reflected in the Block Plan associated with application AWDM/0402/16. We object to this development on the following grounds. -The Adur Development Control Standards (DCS) for extensions and alterations to dwellings state (policy AH7) that an objective should be that "proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings." It is our view that the proposed development runs counter to this objective. -This DCS also states (Section 2.1) that " one of the main planning concerns is to ensure that the proposal will not have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties", and (Section 2.2ii) " that any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent". It is our view that the proposed development would clearly have these adverse effects – and, in some key respects, to a greater degree than would have been the case with the rejected proposal (AWDM/1769/15). -This DCS also states, in relation to rear extensions (Section 3.2) that "the closer a rear extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to adversely affect that property". The c1 m proximity to the boundary of No 196 makes this adverse effect inevitable. -The Adur DCS for space around buildings, in addition to endorsing (Policy AH2) the above objectives, state (Section 2.12) that "the position of a building on a plot should also take into consideration the position of buildings on adjoining plots. A general rule of thumb guide is that there should be no development beyond a 45 degree area measured from the nearest rear window of the neighbouring dwelling". The proposed development completely fails to meet this criteria in respect of the kitchen window of No 196. -The Adur Planning Portal Website states (No 8) *if an extension is within 2m of a boundary maximum eaves height should be no higher than 3m". The currently approved application (AWDM/0144/16) has eaves height of 2.68m compared with the 3m height in the rejected

application. (AWDM?1769/15). A first floor extension clearly breaches this provision and to a much greater extent than that originally, and unsuccessfully, proposed. We consider that the proposed development would be completely detrimental to our property and living conditions for the reasons stated above and trust that our objections, and supporting evidence and references to Council policies which support our case, will be taken fully into consideration. In view of the total scale of the developments currently being undertaken and proposed we would further request a site visit to all the affected properties. Yours sincerely K Mannall N Glover