

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0566/26

Reps and Consults



planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Mon 8 Jun, 19:06 (18 hours ago)

to me

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/06/2026 7:06 PM from Mr Ian Wheeler.

Application Summary

Address:	Mill Warbler Mill Lane Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 5AG
Proposal:	Application to remove condition 7 (no additional windows) of application SU/40/83/TP/FP.
Case Officer:	Marie O'Keeffe

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Ian Wheeler
Email:	
Address:	7 Mill Lane Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	As neighbours, we object to the application to remove condition 7 from SU/40/83/TP/FP, regarding the ability to add additional windows without requiring further consent.

As a backland site, the fact that the application went out to 19 properties, many of which are in the conservation area, indicates how many properties are affected by any changes to the bungalow.

We are concerned that the application has been submitted within the existing building project from the planning permission granted in December 2025. Since the rooflights that were given permission have not yet been constructed in the existing roof, we are concerned that there will be changes to these occurring without planning consultation and permission if this additional application is granted. There are already eight rooflights that have been granted permission and it is concerning that there may be more, or they may become larger without due planning process. I hope I am correct to say that to make any of these into dormer windows would still require planning permission, with or without, condition 7?

The photos taken from the applicants' property are taken at ground level, rather than at first floor level and do not show the extent of the visibility of their property from the neighbouring properties at roof/first floor level where new windows are planned to be constructed. Part of the bungalow is less than a metre away from our boundary and the tree cover is patchy in many areas giving us clear visibility of some of the new planned windows which do directly impact the privacy of our property. Photos taken at 1.8m height with a wide-angle lens, do not show the impact at first floor level (the new floor within the roof).

The applicant notes "substantial garden buffers around their site", however these are all gardens that the respective householders have bought as part of their properties. We do not agree that the garden sizes of surrounding owners, including our own, is a valid argument for the bungalow to remove condition 7. The site area of the infill bungalow does not provide much of a buffer to the properties surrounding it and therefore should not be relying on others' garden sizes to forward their application. In this area of Shoreham, all other houses are built along the roads and the respective back gardens border other back gardens, providing a buffer between properties. This is the only property in the area that is different from this pattern and therefore having the requirement to need planning permission to add/change windows remain valid.

We do not have a problem with small changes to windows at ground floor level, below 2.1m, but changes at the roof level do have an impact on general privacy and loss of amenity and planning permission should still be a requirement.
