Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1159/18

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 23 August 2018 at 11:00
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 11:00 AM on 23 Aug 2018 from Mr Patrick Gardner.

Application Summary

Address: Site At 1 To 84 Beachcroft Place Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Replacement of front and rear communal doors, side lights and glazed screens above, including replacement door access controls. Replacement of existing flat felt roofs and canopies with GRP system

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Patrick Gardner

Email: [redacted]

Address: 49 Beachcroft Place, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 8JN

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Loss of General Amenity

Comments: First I object to the new materials being used. Grey aluminium panels will look horrible compared to the current wooden structure. And I am concerned that they would be noisy in the wind, of which Beachcroft Place gets a lot. I am unconvinced that any replacement is warranted at all in my block, but if it really is essential than the original materials should be used to preserve the look of the block.
Second I object to the new door entry system. This is too complex and is bound to go wrong - I am fearful of being locked out of my own block. I especially object to the lack of a Trades button. This is not just used by the postman but also by people delivering leaflets, the phone directory etc, who will no longer have access to my letter box in the same way as they would to any other house. And re your proposal to give a fob to the postman, this is bound to go wrong - I do not believe that the postman will always have the fob available, thus leading to delays to my postal deliveries.

Please note the following extract from my response to the leaseholder consulation:

"I am extremely concerned that such a complex system could go wrong and lock me out of the block in error, and I am concerned that a fob could be

accidentally or maliciously deactivated (examples of malicious - someone in a row with their partner phones the council to say a key has been lost and needs deactivating, or a redundant council employee deactivates all fobs as their last act before leaving, or the system is hacked. I have total confidence in a physical key and zero confidence in the system you propose. With any hi-tech solution, IF IT CAN GO WRONG, IT WILL GO WRONG!). Also if the system is capable of monitoring comings and goings then this must be deactivated since I do not consent to the council recording, storing, or even knowing about my movements."

I had questions about the door entry system during the consultation that the council leasehold dept has not answered. After reading your planning proposal I now have answers to some of these but am still concerned about the following:

"1 - is entry to the block still possible in event of power failure?
2 - is entry to the block still possible in event the Internet connection is down?
3 - is it possible for the system to monitor comings and goings? If so I do not consent to this.
4 - is it possible for the key fob to become accidentally deactivated? I feel safe with a physical key but am concerned at this complex system denying me entry to my own block.
5 - how many key fobs would be available per flat? I currently have three physical keys which I keep in different places and would require the same again."

Note that in any case the existing keys would have to be retained because they open the doors to the former bin storage area.

I reiterate that this solution is too complex and is bound to go wrong.

I have seen no reference to the proposed changes to the lighting system, to which I have some objections (over removal of the timer), presumably these changes do not require planning permission?