

21 MAY 2026

Business Support

9 Church Street
Shoreham-by-Sea
BN43 5DQ

Your ref. AWD/0508/26

17th. May '26

Dear Mr. Barnett,

1. Thank you for Gary Peck's letter of 28th. April '26 presenting the above planning application, to which we object.
2. There appears a casual, amateurish and, indeed, incompetent manner both to the application and the implementation of the work involved. The word "existing" has evidently acquired an arcane planning definition whereby it means erstwhile: for example no roof light exists, its position is infilled already (leakily, according to Co-op staff). Conversely, installation of the caged access ladder has been approved, yet none has appeared and a repeat application is termed an amendment to the first (ref. AWD/0919/25 Marie O'Keeffe).
3. We are writing from a property immediately adjacent to the Co-op: a property required for access to execute some of the (still incomplete) work of the initial application, whose garden hosted scaffolding poles, in which debris was left, which suffered a drain blocked by waste and whose allocated refuse bin remains damaged by the construction process. None of these points form part of an objection: they are a declaration of our involvement with the project.
4. We made no objection to application AWD/0919/25 as described in Gary Peck's letter of 5th. August '25 because we took it at face value. We believed the existing plant would be replaced in the same position with similar, the word "replace" being used in its conventional sense. While we acknowledge that "replace" can mean to place elsewhere, we are confident that any external arbiter would consider 'not to reposition' to be a clear implication by Mr. Peck rather than an idiosyncratic inference by us. To enclose similar plant in a wooden box would be almost immaterial.
5. The first application makes no mention of the size of the timber enclosure, the second that it's to be 2m. high. This figure is, in

in relative terms, unhelpful. "2m." represents only a third of the length of the fence on the shorter (north) elevation alone, that which faces our garden. The second application does at last introduce the platform on which the plant stands, but the absence of an indication of its height (almost 3 feet) is so conspicuous as to be wilful. Together these edifices present to our property a de facto second storey, blocking sunlight to our garden.

Neither application mentions the continuation of the fence on the west elevation and its right angled turn west. Is it to be removed?

It would be helpful to know the intended purpose of the fence. If it is to hide the plant it is the architectural equivalent of using a hideous crinolined doll to conceal a functional toilet roll. If it is to deter local youth from accessing the Co-op's roof timber is surely not the most appropriate material. Metal railings would perform the task better and better suit the view from Middle Street, in which railings and a fire escape are prominent, and the industrial appearance of the platform support presented to us. Another solution might be to encage the fire escape which effectively invites access.

Are there to be permitted alterations to the new structure post 'completion'? In a bizarre exercise since the current plant was installed, which seemed to serve little purpose other than to provide employment for those conducting it, nearly 3 feet was cut from the height of the fence, whose top had been almost as high as the plant itself. On the side we see (north) the fence remains at something near 4 feet, exposing much of the plant, but on the western elevation the removed section was added to the base of the fence, rendering its own height reduced by a matter of only about 6 inches. All that had been achieved was the unnecessary illustration that the height of the fence and the height of the structure are different.

We admit our embarrassing naivety in thinking there was goodwill in Mr. Peck's letters, but in such spirit make this suggestion for a store for whose presence we are grateful: plant of such colossal dimensions would be best sited close to the eastern wall of the former Barclays

Bank and could be obscured by the addition of a faux second storey on the south facade of the Co-op, bringing its premises in line with all other buildings on the northern side of the High Street.

10. We would be pleased to see the "existing" plant "replaced" to another position, but recognise the application as retrospective. The mere presentation of the new application confirms that the existing plant - i.e. that extant at the time of writing - has been erected without approval. To approve it now would be the laziest and least responsible course the Council could take.

11. In summary, our objections to the application are that the proposed plant and fence deprive us of sunlight and are inappropriate by virtue of appearance, visible materials and character in a conservation area.

12. We understand that the new application is to be considered by the Planning Committee and request to speak at its meeting should such opportunity prove useful.

Yours sincerely,

J. Hayler and S. Sinclair