From: [redacted]
Sent: 04 February 2025 17:17
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: 25 College Road, Southwater, West Sussex RH13 9EE - Planning Application Ref DC/24/1877
Attachments: 25 College Road - Planning Application DC 24 1877 2 (003).pdf

Categories: Comments Received

25 College Road, Southwater, West Sussex RH13 9EE

Planning Application Ref DC/24/1877

For the Attention of Case Officer: Jacques Burrowes

I refer to your letter of 23 January giving 14 days for any further commentary as relates the revised drawing now submitted to accompany this application.

As far as I can see, the only difference between the newly submitted drawings denoted as Revision P3 is that a small area has been annotated with the words “No structure or gutter to over hang to the neighbouring property”.

I must assume this amendment is the applicant’s response to my observation that a detailed analysis of the previously submitted drawings inevitably results in an overhang onto my property. If that is the case then simply annotating that something shown on a drawing will not be allowed to happen is nonsensical. Design and draw accurately and then submit that drawing is the correct action.

Unfortunately, this latest shortcut simply reinforces all the points I have made previously in that the proposed “extension” is overbearing, out of scale with the plot and the surrounding buildings and has been drawn/designed with no recognition of the effects of replacing 75% of the exterior structural walls and increasing the size of the interior of the property by 85%.

As previously advised the construction of a new property as drawn would be grossly inefficient, and structurally questionable.

In order that my consultation responses are all read together and not separated out as a consequence of your latest consultation, I attach my response of 1st January 2025 which should continue to be read in parallel with this latest response.

Enc: Response dated 01.01.25

[redacted]

23 College Road, Southwater, West Sussex, RH13 9EE

4th February 2025

25 College Road, Southwater, West Sussex RH13 9EE

Planning Application Ref DC/24/1877

For the Attention of Case Officer: Jacques Burrowes

I am the owner of 23 College Road and, in connection with the above planning application, I would like to make the following observations. Clearly, a large proportion of my comments remain the same as the previous application Ref DC/24/1365 which was subsequently withdrawn, but which in essence has exactly the same characteristics as this latest application.

1. As with the previous application I appear to be the only party who has been served with the Notice of Application. No Notice of Application is posted in a place visible to the public in close proximity to the property. As this application is far more than a simple household extension it should be properly advertised. Furthermore it is plain that if the application were to be granted, the building works could not be undertaken without encroaching on the adjoining public footpath. A public right of way is affected and this fact should have been advertised also.

2. Running the period for commentary over the Christmas and New Year holiday period with the only extension beyond the minimum consultation period being the addition of statutory public holidays is disingenuous.

3. The application is for a two storey enlargement of the existing end of terrace property. In net internal terms, the proposal results in a property that would increase in size over the original house by 85%

4. This proposed "extension" is in fact a total re-build of the house. It should be recognised that only 25% of the original external structural wall is retained, everything else is new-build. This fact makes very clear what a large imposition this new proposal would have on a terrace of well-formed, small houses and continues to represent gross over ` development

5. The proposed extension is out of character and context with the surroundings. In particular the front elevation, being a continuation of the existing building line, is inappropriate. Horsham District Council's own guidelines on extensions suggest two-storey side additions should be set back from the existing building line.

6. The proposed extension takes up the entire width of the plot and thus the only open access to the rear garden would be by forming a new separate access onto a public right of way.

7. The drawings submitted with this amended application have simply been amended to comply more accurately with the "45 degree rule" as relates rights of light to the adjoining property. The application remains prepared to encroach right up to the limits of rights of light and the negative effect on my adjoining property caused by the excessive bulk of the proposed two storey extension is substantial.

8. Notwithstanding the position as relates purely planning matters, it should be noted that there would need to be a relocation of a public utility owned drainage run that produces an unnecessarily complicated route (the only way to keep the drainage runs clear of the proposed new footprint would be to install three right angle bends which is bad installation practice.

   Stormwater run-off is not properly considered or accounted for. There is a common downpipe which carries away water from the neighbouring roofs which has simply not been accounted for .

   The proposed new flank wall to the rear extension goes right up to the middle point of the boundary between the two properties, but the roof design overhangs my property and is thus not buildable.

   The construction of the new property would either be grossly inefficient (building new structural walls outside the line of the existing structure, on the side elevation only 1 metre away from the existing, and then demolishing the existing building from the inside), or structurally concerning (how would the internal parts of the building be supported during construction etc?). In the first instance the building works would be drawn out and complicated, and in the second require very complex structural calculations and detailed attention to support.

` In neither example is it considered that the property could be inhabited during the main part of the works. The main concerns as direct neighbours would be for the structural integrity of my own property and for the massive nuisance that would be caused during the realizing of this over-ambitious proposal.

` If it were that this or any similar proposal be mistakenly permitted it is essential that a ` maximum time allowance of six months for all external works and working hour ` mandates enforced to at least attempt to minimize disruption.

9. A permission for any type of extension should have a further condition that no further rear extensions are permitted. In particular a replacement of the existing enclosed and roofed decking area to the rear of any more formal extension would be completely inappropriate.

In summary, whilst it is perfectly reasonable for owners of houses on large plots to be allowed very substantial re-building, it is entirely different in the context here of small terraced homes with no buffer zone. Refusing this application does not go against the current desires to generally increase housing provision. It is still incumbent on the planning authority to properly consider an application in it's own unique circumstances.

This planning application should be refused on the grounds that it represents substantial overdevelopment of a very small holding with the associated issues of impossibility of constructing without causing substantial nuisance.

[redacted]

23 College Road, Southwater, West Sussex, RH13 9EE 1st January 2025