From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 20 November 2023 09:39
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1461/23

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 20/11/2023 9:39 AM from Ms Angela Tritton.

Application Summary

Address:	1 Weald Dyke Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 5LP
Proposal:	Retrospective consent for side gables and rear dormer with building to be clad with zinc standing seam covering and larch timber cladding. Changes to north facing first floor window and first floor layout (as previously approved under AWDM/0449/23) increased height to side elevation (as permitted under AWDM/0449/23) to include parapet.
Case Officer:	Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Angela Tritton
Address:	9 Beach Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5LJ

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I STRONGLY object to the recent proposals to the redevelopment on 1 Weald Dyke 1 Change in planning proposal The original planning proposal submitted for review and approval bears little resemblance to what has actually been constructed and was clearly inaccurate and misleading. The original application 0449/23, 23rd March 2023 did not show the very large first story extension with two large windows facing west. Had this been on the original proposal we would have objected most strongly.

Almost straight away a second application 0450/23 also 23 March for the lawful development of the rear dormer, was submitted, but we were not formally notified about this.
The submission of this second planning proposal after the building work had been started is deceitful, misleading and totally unacceptable. It is abundantly clear the construction work proceeded without the knowledge or approval of local residents and I find this attitude absolutely appalling. It makes the submission of plans for approval a complete joke.
This is an underhand way of doing things. Why were these proposals not on the original plan? It suggests the original plans were designed to mislead.
2 Loss of privacy The original plan showed a ground level extension protruding behind our decking area including a large window causing loss of privacy. The actual construction is a huge first-floor extension not shown on the original plans and which includes two large windows which are west facing. These completely overlook my property, rear garden and kitchen windows, and straight into my garden studio . The development of this west facing extension is in direct contravention of planning polices as it does not respect my privacy. We have the right to quiet and private enjoyment of our garden, which is being undermined by this construction. The windows will also overlook other neighbours' property causing further loss of privacy. The developers have not done anything to address the issue of privacy.
I would like to cite my objection to the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1. This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land. Additionally, Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life.
3 Street plan The original planning proposal was roof tiles to match the existing tiles and the walls to be rendered, with timber cladding to the dormers. This is similar to other neighbouring properties. The planning officer report of May 2023 , said, to quote 'this is considered acceptable within the context of the street scene.' Also 'the proposed materials will complement the street scene.' The new proposal contradicts this with the use of zinc and timber cladding instead. This is not in keeping with neighbouring properties, and will be detrimental to the street scene in Weald Dyke and Beach Road. Why was this not on the original plan?
4 Overdevelopment of the site The construction is much larger than the original plan and is too close to neighbouring houses, extending to the boundary of one house.
I request that you take my objections seriously. The major issue is the underhand way in which these applications have been submitted.

Kind regards