Peter Barnett

From: Ann Whitehead [redacted]
Sent: 11 April 2012 16:39
To: Peter Barnett
Subject: FW: Rear of 31 Riverside Road, Shoreham By Sea

Dear Mr Barnett

The date for comments on this planning application is the 11th of April, please can you make sure this email is logged as Ms. Barker is on leave.

Thankyou

Ann
Whitehead

From: DDL
Sent: 11 April 2012 16:31
To: 'Hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk'
Subject: Rear of 31 Riverside Road, Shoreham By Sea

Adur and Worthing Councils
Portland House
Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1LF

Your Ref: AWDM/0378/12

Rear of 31 Riverside Road, Shoreham By Sea

Dear Ms. Barker

We am writing in response to your letter dated 21st March 2012 having now had the opportunity to inspect the documents available online. Unfortunately we have not been able to call in at the Council Offices.

We cannot personally comment on the length of time Mr Fowler has been occupying a houseboat at the site to the rear of 31 Riverside Road.

Having inspected the documentation in detail I am still unclear as to the precise query as the location highlighted in Exhibit 2 – Site Plan, does not match the boat Renata as shown in the photograph Exhibit 2 which in turn does not show the boat in its current position; turned east west, end-on to the jetty.

We do have a number of points that we feel should be considered at this point and these are listed as follows:

- The original planning consent is for a maximum of 5 boats to use the jetty; Exhibit 2 shows 6 boats whilst aerial photography on Google Earth shows 9 boats and this figure does not include the boat Renata which this application concerns.
- The original consent also has conditions to prevent storage of items and materials and the parking of vehicles. All of these appear to have been ignored for some considerable time.
- The planning history of the site, available on your website, clearly demonstrates that the landowner continuously ignores planning regulations and ruling as and when it suits him.

- The Renata in its current position blights the northward views across the river from a number of the local dwellings.
- The "hulk barge" referred to in Mr Rowe's response should in fact have been removed in line with a planning ruling back in 1997.

My main concern is that if this Lawful Development Certificate is granted then, based on the owner's previous tendency to ignore planning regulations which is clear from the site's planning history or an inspection of the site, it will just be a matter of time before the jetty is developed further.
The application as set out is for 1 residential unit (see section 10) but at least three of the boats moored at the jetty appear to have full-time residents, all presumably paying rent to the current owner.

The jetty itself interrupts the tidal flow of the river causing debris and detritus to collect on the west side of the jetty. This presumably includes raw sewage discharged from the several houseboats currently occupied on the jetty and may therefore cause a public health issue.

We also agree with all of the comments of Mrs BJ Goodwin as submitted.

This area is specifically identified for boat moorings under Local Plan Policy AR14 stating "reorganisation of moorings will be approved provided there is no conflict with the operation and natural expansion of the harbour, the scale being appropriate to the character of the locality, local environment considerations including residential amenity and on-site parking arrangements being acceptable". Additionally Policy AB16 of the Local Plan states that "to protect and enhance the important amenity value of the River Adur, development which adversely affects views along and across it between the Surrey Hard and the A27 will not be permitted.

Indeed a prior assessment of the site by Adur District Council in 2008 states that "since the original planning permission was granted for the jetty (SU/23/80/TP) the area either side of the concrete causeway has been gradually filled with rubbish and debris to such an extent that the surface area has increased greatly giving it the appearance of a large hardstanding area. This has been to the detriment of the views across the River Adur, the riverscape in general, biodiversity and the protected estuarine mudflat and saltmarsh habitats."

It would be extremely disappointing if by continuously ignoring planning regulations and enforcement notices, it is then possible to gain permission based on the fact that a site has been used a certain way for a certain length of time.

Regards.

Mrs Ann Whitehead and Mr Andrew Williams

25 Riverside Road

[redacted]