Fred Mukuna

NB FTO
Planning Appeal - Shoreham Beach
PINS

From: BOLES, Nick [redacted]
Sent: 11 November 2013 11:13
To: EEMA_NBOLES
Subject: FW: Planning Shoreham Beach West Susseex
Attachments: planning appeal letter a hill.docx

From: Theresa [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: 11 November 2013 10:47
To: BOLES, Nick; LOUGHTON, Timothy; [redacted]
Subject: Planning Shoreham Beach West Susseex

Dear Sirs,

Please find a copy of a letter that I have sent to the planning inspectorate re an appeal for 39 Old Fort Rd. This is the 3rd appeal going through at the moment. I have also attached a copy of a letter re one of the other appeals no 25 Old Fort Rd. The property in this one has already been built to high and in the wrong place, and planning passed the retrospective amendments despite 57 objections, but with a proviso opaque glass. The developer put in the windows with the no opaque glass and opening windows, and then appealed against the decision for opaque glass and also then applied to have opening windows, this last bit has just been approved, yet again despite many objections. The developers are making a farce of the planning department here, and something needs to be done. Properties are being built different to the planning approval, and no check seems to be done to see that they meet the requirements set out under their planning approval.

I beseech you to please look at what is happening to our environment and community. Our old bungalows are being bought up by developers, knocked down and then replaced with multiple properties usually 3 storey. They disguise these a 2 storey with roof room or access and it seems the planers are falling for it.

Please, please help us to stop this blight on what was a lovely bit of the south east, before greed took hold.

Kind regards Theresa Dupuy

35 East Meadway Shoreham Beach

[redacted]

35 East Meadway
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5RF
2/10/2013

Dear Sirs

Re: Planning Inspectorate Number APP/Y3805/A/13/2206067

There must be something drastically wrong with the planning system, because it does not seem to matter how many objections there are - the plans still get passed, and there were many objections to these plans.

In the past - Shoreham Beach was known as Bungalow Town, with its quirky properties and close community, it had space. But if we keep allowing the developers to knock down these individual properties and rebuild with multiple properties on a single site - we are destroying all of that .

This developer, has used the excuse they are building these houses (4 Houses) for family, but they are not going to live in all of the properties they are building. They may live in 1 and then sell the remaining 3 for a vast profit. They don't seem to care about the effect they are having on their neighbours. The distress, the feeling of privacy being removed, the loss of sky, light and views, and when obscure glass is insisted upon, **they appeal**, even though the obscure glass will not take away the feeling of being overlooked, of ones personal and private space being invaded. Of noise levels increasing due to the close proximity to neighbours, it was a small compromise, to the blight they were causing.

These houses should never have been allowed to be built in the first place, I believe if the Planning Inspectorate or the Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government actually viewed the properties that have been built, they would agree. Even when the properties were found to have been built too high and too close to the rear boundary, and they were asked to stop, they kept on building. There were 58 objections to this and at the planning meeting the developers got away with it, what kind of message is it sending to other developers in the area. They call them 2 storey with roof access, but they are 3 storey and are very intrusive to the surrounding properties. These ugly slab sided - 3 story blocks are not in keeping with the area, they are not asthetically pleasing , there's no facilities for cars and visitors parking, which causes the roads around these developments to become congested. They give the reasons for the 3rd story for roof gardens and garden rooms. If only one property was replaced by one property on a site then they could have proper gardens to sit in and enjoy.

I believe that some of the Government guidelines on Planning and building are as follows -

Planning that encourages a diversity of housing and development while enhancing our well-being and protecting our most precious assets:
the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land we grow our food on.
Planning that: •brings communities together rather than isolating them. - •sees heritage as an asset rather than a liability.

These houses do none of this, and the destruction of the heritage and community of Shoreham Beach has to stop.

I therefore ask you to refuse this appeal, but also to come and see what is happening for yourselves before it is all ruined.

Yours sincerely

Theresa Dupuy

35 East Meadway
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5RF
8/11/2013

12 NOV 2013

Dear Sirs

Re: Planning Inspectorate Number APP/Y3805/W/13/2207923 – 39 Old Fort Rd

There must be something drastically wrong with the planning system, because it does not seem to matter how many objections there are – these type of plans are still getting passed, and there were many objections to these plans.

They do not seem to care about the effect they are having on the neighbours. The distress, the feeling of privacy being removed, the loss of sky, light and views, of ones personal and private space being invaded or of noise levels increasing due to the close proximity to neighbours.

The houses being built on Shoreham Beach, just like these, should never have been allowed to be built in the first place. I believe if the Planning Inspectorate or the Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government actually viewed these properties that have been built, they would agree. They call these properties 2 storey with roof room and roof terrace, but they are in fact **3 storey** and are extremely intrusive to the surrounding properties. These ugly slab sided - 3 story blocks are not in keeping with the area, they are not aesthetically pleasing, there's no facilities for cars and visitors parking, which causes the roads around these developments to become congested, and no garden space for children to play in. They give the reasons for the 3rd story for roof gardens and garden rooms. If only one property was replaced by one property on a site then they could have proper gardens to sit in and enjoy. If you have to build, then build 2 storey properties in keeping with the rest of Shoreham Beach. I am not against progress, but it should be progress that is in keeping with the area.

I believe that some of the Government guidelines on Planning and building are as follows -

Planning that encourages a diversity of housing and development while enhancing our well-being and protecting our most precious assets:
The air we breathe, the water we drink and the land we grow our food on.
Planning that: •brings communities together rather than isolating them. - •sees heritage as an asset rather than a liability.

These houses do none of this, and the destruction of the heritage and community of Shoreham Beach has to stop. In the past - Shoreham Beach was known as Bungalow Town, with its quirky properties and close community, it had space. But if we keep allowing the developers to knock down these individual properties and rebuild with multiple 3 storey properties on a single site - we are destroying all of that.

I therefore ask you to refuse this appeal, but also to come and see what is happening for yourselves before it is all ruined.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Theresa Duguy