From:	planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent:	02 November 2021 11:43
To:	planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject:	Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1846/21

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/11/2021 11:42 AM from Mr Barry Goodwin.

Application Summary

Address:	18 Southdown Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5AN
Proposal:	Variation of Condition 1 (approved plans) and Condition 3 (materials) of approved AWDM/1761/20 to allow use of concrete cladding to garden room, insertion of window to south elevation and reversal of roof pitch
Case Officer:	Eve Hearsey

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Barry Goodwin
Address:	22 Southdown Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5AN

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design
Comments:	Barry Goodwin 22 Southdown Road Shoreham by Sea West Sussex BN43 5AN Gary Peck Planning Service Manager Planning Services Adur-Worthing Councils Portland House 44 Richmond Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 1HS Your Reference AWDM/1846/21 Date 2nd November 2021 Dear Mr Peck, Re: Variation of Condition 1 (approved plans) and Condition 3 (materials) of approved AWDM/1761/20 to

allow use of concrete cladding to garden room, insertion of window to south elevation and reversal of roof pitch: 18 Southdown Rd Shoreham by Sea
Thank you for your letter of 15th October 2021 to which I submit the following:
I understand that the building has encroached over my neighbour's border, this cannot be right!
The variations mentioned, have already been carried out, why did the inspector who recently visited site not report the changes?
I understand that the north boundary wall of the building has been upgraded with fire resisting materials.
Why is there no mention of fire resisting separation in any previous correspondence / documents?
What specification has been required for this fire proofing and what materials were used?
Why has it only been installed on the north side - what about potential lateral spread from the north corners of the east and west walls, the roof and even the nearby unprotected openings (door and window)?
Will this fire resisting work be accredited and signed off as meeting required standards?
Why is there no reference to fire resistance in the initial application/approval?
I would like to reference extracts from document entitled:
Committee Report dated 08/02/21 - Application Number: AWDM/1761/20 which formed the basis on which planning permission was granted.
Paragraph - Proposal, Site and Surroundings states that:
The proposal is to demolish the existing garage (measuring 5m wide x 6.15m long x
2.45m high at western end (2.4m at eastern end), and replace it with a flat roof single
storey studio outbuilding of an identical footprint and 2.5m high.
The building will be of a timber framed construction and externally is shown to be horizontally clad with Siberian Larch cladding. The site is within the Shoreham Conservation Area.
Paragraph - Statement from Architect (submitted before the amendment) states that:
The Agent submitted a statement which outlines the situation of the existing garage
and the proposed new building, the subject of this application.
The proposal is thereby to demolish the building and erect on the same footprint a single
storey garden room. This would normally be permitted development as it is no more than
2.5m high, however, it is in a Conservation Area, therefore planning is required.
Paragraph - Planning Assessment
The proposal seeks to demolish an existing substandard garage and replace the building
with a structure of the same footprint i.e. 5m x 6.15m but will be 2.5m in height. The
replacement will be a garden room.
Paragraph - Visual Amenities and Impact on Conservation Area
The replacement building will be of the same footprint

dimensions as the existing
outbuilding and will be no higher than 2.5m. The elevation that will be positioned close
to the mutual boundary with no. 20 will have no windows within it, and if approved, a
condition preventing windows within that elevation would be appropriate.
The height of the structure at 2.5m would be some 500mm above a permitted boundary
height of 2m, and because the structure is located away from the main dwelling it is not
considered that the 500mm would result in unacceptable harm on the visual amenities of
no.20.
The material proposed for the structure is Siberian Larch cladding, horizontally positioned.
Siberian Larch is a very resinous wood which makes it durable and ideal for external use
and therefore will be appropriate to be used on the outbuilding, and the use of this wood,
would not adversely affect the visual amenities or the character or appearance of the
conservation area.

There is a common thread running throughout this document in as much as the maximum height of this building was consistently quoted to be 2.5 metres.
This building has been constructed off a raised concrete plank and is considerable higher than that which has been approved.
Furthermore the cladding was stated to be Siberian Larch which would have provided a natural 'fence like' boundary to the neighbours rather than coloured cement plastic cladding which significantly adversely affects the visual amenities, the character and appearance within this Conservation Area.
County and Regional Policy - CH4 of the adopted West Sx Structure Plan 2001-16 requires new development to preserve and, where possible, enhance conservation areas and to protect character and appearance.
This building in no way complies with the above.
Unsympathetic Extensions, Alterations and Decoration to Buildings
The Council should aim to ensure that all new buildings and extensions in the area are in keeping with the character of the area.
This building clearly does not adhere to the above. It is totally out of character for this Conservation Area being a plastic clad box. If this was presented to the Planning Committee, in this current form, they would surely have arrived at a conclusion to refuse rather approve the application.
How and why have you not corrected this planning anomaly?
I am asking that this planning application is sent back to the Planning Committee for re-consideration.
Yours sincerely

Barry Goodwin

Kind regards