Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0436/19

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 4 April 2019 at 22:30
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 10:35 PM on 04 Apr 2019 from Mrs Wendy Filmer.

Application Summary

Address: 89 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HA

Proposal: Non-Material Amendment to outbuilding permitted under AWDM/0685/16 for revisions to openings on south elevation and to floor layout to provide home office and WC in place of gym.

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Wendy Filmer

Email: [redacted]

Address: 27 East Meadway, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5RF

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise
- Trees and Landscaping

Comments: Objection to AWDM/0436/19

1. My first objection to this application is that a large part of the changes requested by this application have already been completed, without any authorisation from the planning department. This work began on 22 February 2019 when my neighbours and myself witnessed it. Adur and Worthing Planning was informed on 26 February and an enforcement officer visited the site on 5 March. Thus, this application can only be considered as retrospective.

2. I object to this application being considered as a non-material amendment. The adding of a request for a toilet, a basin and sink and all of the necessary excavating of trenches and sewerage underground pipes and the connection of services (which has already been completed, see above) is NOT non-material. It is a major change and one that is not on the approved plan (AWDM/0685/16 - 3 June 2016).

The inclusion of these facilities were objected to in the original and not amended plan submitted in the application AWDM/0685/16 - dated 12 May 2016.

Which I have a validated and stamped copy of. It has disappeared from the online archived documents on the planning application AWDM/0685/16. I can supply a copy to complete your archive if you have misplaced it.

3. This current application is a very similar plan that the applicant wanted in May 2016 which included a bathroom (AWDM/0685/16 - dated 12 May 2016). But this was then amended, to remove the bathroom element (3 June 2016) and was then approved.

We are once more objecting to this application as before on the grounds that it would become a separate self-contained dwelling. Particularly as the new plan now contains a sink in a separate room to bathroom. Thus, providing kitchen facilities. And the space previously allotted to the shower (in 2016) still remains.

This goes directly against the Decision Notice for AWDM/0685/16 (06/07/2016): "The accommodation hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the property as a whole (as it exists at the date of this permission) as a single dwellinghouse and shall not be used as a separate dwelling."

4. Once again, I must point out and object that the tree in my SE corner directly behind the applicant's rear boundary is "within falling distance to the development" and still is not coded on the applicant's plan.
In fact, the applicant answered NO to question 7: "are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development."
I assume this information is required because it should be noted by Planning for safety reasons and possible damage inflicted on the already existing tree.

5. The applicant expresses his reason for the application as sometime in the future he might use it for a home office but (with no members of the public coming into it). So, this is just a future possibility and does not reflect a current need.
Even if a home office becomes required, it's hard to understand why a toilet, basin and sink would be required. Maybe this is more appropriate for a separate self-contained accommodation.

6. As called out before, the fact that the major ground work has already been carried out (starting 22 Feb) and now is being positioned as a Non-material planning application makes this application even more problematic.

Please note the applicant submitted this application on 15 March, 21 days after the ground work had begun (and since been completed).

Please review this application as retrospective and record it as such.