38 Brighton Road,
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 6RG

Adur & Worthing Councils,
Development Management Economy Directorate,
Portland House, 44 Richmond Road,
Worthing, West Sussex,
BN11 1HS

10th October2019

Without Prejudice
Ref: Objection to Application for Change of Use of Residential Dwelling (Use Class C3) into 3 bedroom guesthouse with separate owners accommodation (Use Class C1), 4 Brighton Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6RG.
(Reference Number:AWDM/1470/19)

Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing to express our objection to the proposed change of use at No.4 from a change as a residential property to a commercial guesthouse with a small separate owner's accommodation in the attic.

ADUR & WORTHING
15 OCT 2019
PLANNING SERVICES

Our objection falls under the following relevant planning considerations:

1. Planning policies
2. Traffic and Parking
3. Previous Decisions
4. Loss of Privacy, noise and disturbance
5. Character

1. Planning Policy

We are opposing the proposition for permission on the grounds initially, that these premises are already in use as a bed and breakfast and have been for some considerable time, therefore what should have in actuality been applied for is *retrospective* permissionNo.4 Brighton Road has been operating as a commercial guesthouse called "The Anchorage" without planning permission for a little over 1 year at least which shows an intentional and flagrant disregard of planning policy.
Rooms were publicly advertised at £40 per person per night but this is currently £70 per person per night post this application for planning permission. Verbal communication with near neighbours produces no evidence of circulation of intent before this. Residents at No.6 and at No. 2 noticed a "Vacancies" sign in the window back in July 2018. When a resident of No.6 enquired about this, Noel D. Mathers, a resident of No. 4 was evasive and claimed it was an ornament. Adjoining and local properties first became aware of the change to a guesthouse when guests began appearing in August and a sign for "The Anchorage B&B" was later placed by the front entrance of No.4 as well as a website on Google with many reviews of guest stay at the property of No.4. We have noticed recently that many of these reviews have disappeared from Google and Facebook as of the 04/10/2019. Of the 20 neighbours who were officially notified of the planning application, only three households lived on Brighton road whilst all others live in Jervington Court apartment block which has its own parking and was not nearly as badly affected by the presence of a guesthouse which is in breach of planning permission. The vast majority of residents negatively affected by the B&B on Brighton Road were completely unaware of this planning application. In an effort to redress this balance the residents of No.6 and No.2 have attempted to notify as many of their neighbours as possible, but there are many that are still unaware of this planning application or the impending closing date. This therefore has prevented residents of Brighton Road of their right to be informed of local planning changes that will impact them.

According to a planning statement from Lewis & Co Planning Consultants that were hired by the owner of the property Fran Jane Kay, they claim this Bed and Breakfast only opened three months before the planning application. However, on booking.com there is a listing at the address No.4 Brighton Road with over 100 reviews, of which a number date back to August 2018 with responses ending "from Fran and Noel" or "From The Anchorage". Screenshots of this can be obtained from residents of No. 6 if the reviews are not still available online.

There is also a serious question as to whether the owner of the property can produce evidence that she had appropriate insurance coverage or if she informed her insurance provider of the change from a residential to a commercial guesthouse before August 2018. Or indeed if the insurance company was made aware this guesthouse was in breach of planning policy.

Another point is the planning permission showing the property owned by Fran Jane Kay is disputed. The space allegedly owned by her between the garage owned by No.2 Brighton Road was previously claimed as being 5m by 5m whereas on the planning application it is shown as being 11m by 5m. There also is currently a question over ownership of this space.

A final point is that a document in the planning application appears with a comment of "No objections on PSH grounds" from a "Mr. Private Sector Housing" who apparently works in the planning office. There no other name associated with this document that indicates who it is from. This is an odd document and causes local residents who have viewed it to question whether this documents even counts as a valid supporting document.

2. Traffic and Parking

We are objecting on the grounds this has already had a detrimental effect on the already chronically overcrowded traffic and parking situation on Brighton Road. Large numbers of guests using the residence No.4 Brighton Road as a guesthouse travel in cars. The property No. 4 Brighton Road has two parking spaces in front of their house and claim they have one area behind the property of No.2 between a garage owned by No.2 and a building which is used as an electrical sub-station previously mentioned. To use this space would necessitate being within 1 metre of the fire access to the electrical sub-station blocking access. The owners are presuming and leading the planning authorities to believe they have permission to access this disputed area. However, access to this area is not possible without the express permission of No.2. The laneway to this land is owned by No.2 and easement is granted to the UK Powers Network in case maintenance needs to be carried out at the electrical substation. However, easement (access) is not extended to No.4 at all. The residents of No.4 Brighton Road did not obtain permission from No. 2 to use this access but have continued to use it despite this. When the space in question has had more than two cars parked in that area it not only blocked fire access to the substation but also blocked turning access for the garage owned by residents at No. 2 leaving them unable to use their own garage.

Guests and visitors have also been using up parking on the street which is vital for local families that need to go about their everyday business.

The owner and other resident of No. 4 appear to have about three vehicles, two cars and a camper van the last of which they have been intentionally unwilling to provide parking for. The camper van is too large to fit into any of the spaces mentioned. Residents have already been in dispute with owner of the campervan and resident of No. 4 Noel D. Mathers who has several times expressed that the guesthouse is his business. The residents of No.4 parked it on the double yellow line in front of No.6 over the months of February and March 2019. This can currently be seen clearly on Google Street view. Noel D. Mathers even attempted to obscure the yellow line with stones brought over from the beach. The owner of the Ground Floor Flat at No. 2 can supply photographic evidence of this. After considerable protest the vehicle was eventually moved in front of another house further down Brighton Road, this causing another dispute with residents there. It was then moved to the turning point of Shoreham Academy School on Kingston Lane, upon which a notice from school management was issued to force Noel D. Mathers to move it. The camper van is currently parked on a Bus stop on Kingston Lane outside Ashcroft nursing home where it has been for at least 1 month.

This demonstrates the residents of No.4 are themselves unable to accommodate the vehicles they already own with the two parking spaces outside their house and cannot realistically accommodate their guests. There is already a chronic shortage of street parking for residents in this area and the problem has already been exacerbated by the guests frequenting this unauthorized bed and breakfast.

3. Previous decisions

Apart from the issues relating to parking and traffic another consideration is the prerequisite of the validated planning permission (AWDM/0219/11) for the garage owned by No.2 was that it was not for commercial use. This planning application was permitted by the council on the 11/07/2011. Therefore, this is another point that calls into question the assumption that the space next to it can be used for commercial purposes as an extension of a guesthouse.
A previous application for a residence at the back of No. 4 for a dependent relative (reference number: AWDM/1893/18) first presented on the 18/12/2018 was also later withdrawn. This seems to have partly been due to a letter written by the Legal Co-Ordinator at UK Power network, Allison Ring who was concerned about the proximity of the proposed new build to the electrical substation. Two points in this letter which would likely be of concern to UK power networks in this case concern vehicular access and climbing aids under "other points".
"4.UK Power Networks require 24 hour vehicular access to their substation. Consideration for this should be taken during the design stage of development.". Fran Jane Kay and Noel D. Mathers in this case have not taken this into consideration as they are currently using the area in front of the substation as parking spaces for themselves and their guests and thus leaving no room for maintenance team. Ownership of this space is unclear and in view of prior highlighted concerns in previous applications it seems odd that UK Power Networks were not contacted for this planning application.
The second point is that the Legal Co-Ordinator of Power Networks also expressed grave concerns in the previously mentioned letter as to the viability of use of this space as it pertains to security of the substation.
These concerns appear to have been one of the causes for this application to be withdrawn by the 08/02/2019.

4. Loss of Privacy, noise and disturbance

An additional problem to consider is the loss of privacy and increase in disturbance and noise. Since No.4 began operating the bed and breakfast, there has been an increase in foot traffic from guests parking their cars. The garden wall of the front of No. 2 is low and the window are quite large and the volume of guests going to park their cars makes the private property of No. 2 more public than is desirable. The noise of guest's cars as well as talking and their footsteps echo in the laneway and can be clearly heard from the bedroom of the household of No.2. Guests naturally have less of a concern when it comes to privacy and abstaining from making disturbing noise due to their short-term stay.
Another issue is the attitude of the owners of No.4 when issues with parking come up. The additional disputes to do with parking and arguments arising from Noel D. Mathers and his guests to the guesthouse particularly the issues mentioned in point 2. Traffic and Parking make life more stressful – un-necessarily so and are thus another disturbance.

5. Character

The character of the house and the area has already been negatively impacted by the appearance of this B&B/guesthouse. This street has always been a residential area meant for families and people who will work in and add to the community.
The RNLI, for example relies on the surrounding community to remain an affordable residential area so young people can continue to volunteer and provide a vital emergency service. The occupants of No.6 are RNLI volunteers and continue this tradition. All recruits must live within five minutes of the station so they can respond to any distress or accident in a timely fashion. There are also numerous community events such as arts classes, clubs, concerts, theatres, leisure centers, cinema, local charitable concerns as well as shops and restaurants which are supported by residents throughout the year and not by guests or visitors whose business is seasonal and thus unreliable. This is what the council means by sustainable growth, constant trading and permanent residency, not unreliable, unprofitable seasonal trade.
These aspects of the character of the area cannot continue if speculators monopolise the dwindling residential accommodation for their own personal gain particularly through inappropriate commercial ventures.
This guesthouse is not only disruptive in terms of the previously mentioned considerations, it is unnecessary. A simple Google search will bring up a large range of holiday accommodation from simple and boutique bed and breakfasts to luxury guesthouses and hotels competing for business from Lancing and Worthing to Brighton. Most of these are within 3 or 4 miles of Brighton Road. This does not include Air BnB that also exist nearby, of which one already exists on this road. The council is already visibly supporting many other local commercial ventures in this area. This proves that the council has more than fulfilled its obligations to support businesses of this kind who are better placed to provide these services. The closure of some guesthouse accommodation

that is mentioned in the Lewis & Co planning statement rather refutes the idea that B&B being run by Noel D. Mathers is necessary as it seems more likely these guesthouses closed due to lack of business. The owner of the property Frances Jane Kay and the resident and owner of the B&B Noel D. Mathers although past or near retirement were both engaged in gainful employment before they began operating this unregulated guesthouse. This venture therefore has not given employment to anyone who was unemployed before its appearance and has added nothing to the character of the area. The character of this area should be preserved for family homes as this is what council needs to focus on.

Final Comments;
The owner of No. 4 Fran Jane Kay moved into the five-bedroom house with one other adult and were both near retirement age. Therefore, purchase of such a large property for so few residents suggests long term planning and speculation to convert the residence into a commercial asset presumably for speculative sale. This is in direct opposition to council policy of supporting residents and providing affordable housing which is fit for purpose. The council has already admitted to a shortage of housing which certainly will not be met by current building projects mentioned in the housing strategy. Adur and Worthing areas have a limited amount of residential land and it needs to be protected There is a disproportionate number of elderly people in Adur and in the long- term considerations have to be made as to who will live, work and support growth and an aging population in this area. The council may have an obligation to encourage economic growth, but they also have an obligation to support the younger generation by making possible affordable housing in the private and the council sector so that economic growth is sustainable. It is also important to maintain the quality of life for its residents. Houses cannot just be made smaller and smaller. It is important that households have easy access to a garden or outdoor area and that houses themselves do not become cramped, leading to lack of daylight, bad air quality and damp. Which contributes to mental health issues such as SADS, respiratory problems and the likelihood of carcinogens being present, all of which burdens the NHS with problems that could be prevented with appropriate accommodation. This country has a past urban history of slum dwelling and it is a problem that still needs to be tackled today. Growth of any kind is people led, not speculator led. Commercialization and over-development which takes away housing has a negative effect on the younger generation's ability to engage and continue to support the community. Speculation is at the expense of the younger generations living opportunities and contributes to the aging population problems (worker shortages via nowhere to live) and economic decline. It is economic polarisation.

This council needs to stop encouraging people who know the price of everything and the value of nothing.

Yours Sincerely
The Residents of No. 2 Brighton Road

The Resident of No. 38 Brighton Road [redacted]