From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 25 July 2022 16:57
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1162/22

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/07/2022 4:57 PM from Mr Adrian Holmes.

Application Summary

Address:	9 The Street Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 5NJ
Proposal:	Application for Listed Building Consent for single storey building to south to provide a kitchen and bedroom with a shower room with glazed link to connect the new and existing buildings. Application for Variation of Condition 6 (trees/bushes/hedges) of previously approved AWDM/1180/21.
Case Officer:	Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Adrian Holmes
Address:	23 Lesser Foxholes, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5NT

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	Quite apart from the conservation perspective highlighted by others in their objections, the existing condition in relation to the poplar trees is intended to provide some protection for us in relation to the impact of the close proximity and overbearing nature of the extension. This can be seen in the report pack to the Adur Planning Committee meeting of 6th December 2021 (section in relation to AWDM/1180/21). There is not enough detail of the proposed replacement in the application to assess the degree to which the current screening would be impacted. However, judging from the Proposed Plan (drawing number 443/10): 1. the intention is for a small hedge rather than replacement trees. This would suggest that it

could not provide the current level of screening.

2. the length of the proposed hedge appears (estimating from the plan) to be around 2.5M, while the current breadth of screening from the trees along the boundary is significantly more.

Our conclusion from the plan is that the level of screening would be significantly reduced and possibly non-existent.

In the absence of a more detailed proposal, we believe that acceptance of the application would result in the Council abandoning the principle of protection of our residential amenities, which underlies condition 6.

In the event that the Council is sympathetic to the issue presented in the application and so minded to agree to it, and there are no further details forthcoming, we would suggest that the Council specify some parameters that need to be met by the replacement e.g. minimum height (as at the time of planting), minimum breadth along the boundary wall, acceptable plants to be used, maximum period of time between removal of the poplar trees and the planting of the replacement etc.

Adrian Holmes and Liz Ward-Holmes

Kind regards