From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 11 August 2021 12:12
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1393/21

Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 11/08/2021 12:12 PM from Mr Andrew Popkiewicz.

Application Summary

Address: 9 Queens Place Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5AA

Proposal: Proposed Rear dormer.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Popkiewicz

Address: 14 Queens Place, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5AA

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: It is with renewed dismay that I learn of the new application for a roof extension to a nearby property in Queens Place - Nr 9. The Council has already approved several of these clumsy, insensitive and intrusive constructions with seemingly no regard for the objections of the people actually adversely affected. Most of the residents originally moved to this street because of its charm and friendliness.

I consider it unwise and irresponsible of the Council to have previously approved those dormers already in place - a view which, I believe, is even shared to some extent by several of the councillors. Developing the roof spaces of these small Victorian terraced cottages into attic rooms would surely have been sufficient and would impact so much less on neighbours, and the area as a

whole.

I know that I and my wife are not the only residents upset by these crude black-tiled 'sheds in the sky'. I am aware that one neighbour has you sent a number of photographs which illustrate the damage to the historic nature and appearance of the street, not least because the area is meant to be subject to a conservation order. I am enclosing a couple more with this letter which, I believe, demonstrate the ugliness and oppressive quality of just one dormer (erected in 2017) seen from our garden.

May I also draw your attention to the fact that the consequence of the proliferation of these overbearing adjuncts is, to a degree, causing a breakdown of cohesion within the community, which must surely be a consideration for those with a responsible approach to planning.

Other obvious consequences of approving more of these expansive projects would inevitably be to increase the population density in our street, add to the parking problems, and not least, cause serious disturbance during the construction of these offensive developments.

We are anxious that the blight does not spread any further along the street. We are therefore strongly objecting to the proposed dormer in conjunction with a significant number of local residents.

cc. Peter Barnett, Neil Parkin, Gabe Crisp

Kind regards