

Sent: 11 March 2014 11:02
To: Janice Chapman
Subject: Extension Application No: EG/5/14

Dear Mrs Chapman,

Further to our meeting this morning, I am writing to express my own comments, and that of my wife's, regarding the proposed extension to No. 49 Elm Grove, Barnham.

For the sake of simplicity, I will confine these to comments in relation to Policy D DM4: Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings (residential and non-residential - ref 13.4.6 local plan).

When considering applications for extensions and alterations to existing buildings, the Council will require that: -

a. the extension or alteration sympathetically relates to and is visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, massing, design, form, scale and materials: visually the change from sloped roof bungalow to 2 storey, flat roof elevation at the rear is not integrated. The massing and scale from the elevations presented to this neighbouring property represent very substantial changes (eg. roof surface on view x 2.5, height of structure doubled at rear extension).

b. the extension or alteration is visually subservient to the main building (...): clearly this is not the case from the rear and side elevation.

c. the extension or alteration does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties: on all three counts, overshadowing, overlooking and overbearing, there are significant issues affecting this neighbouring property. Early to mid morning sunlight is reduced to the main reception rooms and bedrooms of 48 Elm Grove, which is a double fronted property, the front door being directly opposite the proposed development, and at approximately 9 metres' distance, including the 1 metre gap beyond the boundary line. The two storey rear elevation overlooks, and being so close is overbearing on, our garden's appearance and use.

e. the extension or alteration does not compromise the established spatial character and pattern of the place but is instead a positive addition: visually and otherwise, and for the reasons given above, it would not be a 'positive' addition. The addition is negative from the perspective of this property, and perhaps also, it could be argued, detracts from the 'spatial character' of the existing site.

Whilst we understand our neighbour's wish to extend her property, we believe that a more sympathetic proposal could have been drawn up, and matters such as placement of the new kitchen and upper storey bedroom need not necessarily have been sited as proposed, so close to our property line. Equally, the questions of roof line, rear elevations, scale, etc. could have been addressed more sympathetically. We

therefore feel some modification would be proper in order to reduce the considerable impact of the proposed development on this property.

Thank you for coming to visit this morning. We hope that it will have proved useful to your considerations.

Yours sincerely,

Alastair and Sarah Martin