Gmail by Google

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

AWDM/1152/19

1 message

[redacted]

22 August 2019 at 17:58

Dear Sirs,

One does not need to be one of those prospectively adversely affected by this application to oppose it on the following grounds:

1. A site more unsuitable for the creation of as many as six new residential units, whether for people disabled or able-bodied, it would be hard to imagine. The site itself manifestly admits of only minimal provision, while the Shoreham High Street section of the main arterial A259 onto which it opens is registered as being one of the most traffic-congested and air-polluted roads in West Sussex. In the light of the inexorable Adur-side and other developments scheduled to take place both to the east and to the west, without commensurate enhancement of the essential supportive infrastructure, these conditions can only deteriorate further. Moreover, public car parking space locally is already both scarce and strictly time-limited, while neither within this proposed development nor anywhere in the vicinity are there any such spaces designated and reserved for people with disabilities. In which regard, as in others impacting on the environment, this development can not be considered in isolation from that of the adjacent Old Town Hall (OTH), for which planning approval has already been granted (by AWDM/0739/14) for 4 x 1-bed. maisonettes, 1 x 1-bed. flat and 1 x 2-bed. flats. In neither development has any provision whatsoever been made for might well prove to be a total of more than a dozen 'resident' vehicles, some of them belonging to and being essential to disabled people.

2. In any event, it can not be desirable, nor even acceptable, that people with disabilities be 'ghettoed' together, whether on this site or elsewhere, in the manner here envisaged. Best practice prescribes that the disadvantaged be embraced without segregation in the

   general community, whereby they can both render their own particular contributions and derive from their neighbours such support and assistance as they may require. Should their needs be such that they are indeed best accommodated collectively, such accommodation should include provision for residential supervision, here noticeable by its absence. To suggest that this site might constitute a location suitable for disabled people – and be occupied solely by such persons – challenges comprehension.

3. Neither any of the architectural drawings of the proposed development nor the quasi-photographic impression of it as seen from an aerial position to the south-east includes the 2nd-storey addition to the extension at the south end of Tosca's restaurant for which – despite that extension itself having been built other than in conformity with its own permission – planning approval has been given (by AWDM/0054/19) but which has not yet been constructed. When this is built it will not only blight Flat 1 in particular of Town Quay Apartments (TQA) – as was made clear in the objections to that application – but will radically impair the river-facing aspect of this proposed new development which realistically constitutes the sole ground for its proposal. To appreciate the nature and the full extent of this detraction, one need only re-cast the architectural drawings and the photo-impression with that 2nd-storey addition included.

4. No access has been provided for the proposed six new residents to either their storage units or their refuse and recycling bins other than either through the retail unit – a route which will clearly be unavailable altogether when that unit is closed and will in any event entail negotiating the steps to and fro their back yard – or by exiting their premises through their front door into the High Street and then proceeding past the front of the OTH, down Town Quay to the river wall and along the walkway past the front of TQA. This is palpably impractical – and, when disposing of waste or rubbish, potentially embarrassing – particularly for

people with disabilities. Those same considerations will apply to residents seeking to gain access for recreational purposes either to their back yard – this being the only external space within the development, but which will in fact be totally overshadowed by the Tosca addition above referred to – or to the riverside walkway.

5. Since it has been asserted that the residents' refuse and recycling bins will not be serviced by the Council, seemingly on the grounds of the impossibility of access for its vehicles along the riverside walkway, how and by whom will those bins be serviced? This must be established; failure to service those bins regularly and satisfactorily will give rise to offensive odours, to the infestation of the area by insects and vermin and to other potential health hazards, such considerations being all the more important in view of the proximity of Tosca's restaurant next door.

6. By the same token but even more importantly, if there will be no access to the rear of the proposed development for refuse vehicles, what access will there be for emergency vehicles, particularly for fire engines? A fire or any other emergency in an upper floor of this four-storey building might well entail the use of ladders, but no vehicle so equipped could gain access to the building through the low entrance arch to the courtyard to TQA.. Should the building, or any part of it, indeed be occupied by people with disabilities, this consideration would become all the more pertinent.

7. The proposed development will prospectively both impose additional usage upon and impair access to the sewer pipe which serves both Chambers Bistro (part of OTH) and TQA. Blockage of this pipe has already caused offence, nuisance and potentially health hazardous problems to residents of TQA on at least four recent occasions. No development should be allowed to proceed which does not allow of full remedial access to that pipe.

8. The erection of a four-storey building as and where proposed will reduce the courtyard between TQA and OTH from a largely open and congenial 'lung' to an alley-like space surrounded, dominated and almost totally enclosed by towering walls by which – in conjunction with the 2nd-storey addition to Tosca restaurant's extension above referred to – direct sunlight will be almost totally and permanently excluded. Among its other impairments of the environment, it will put an end not only to Chambers Bistro's being able to claim that its small open dining terrace in the north-east corner of the courtyard is "sunlit" but also to both of the cherished flower beds which provide welcome verdure and colour to the courtyard as well as therapeutic occupation for the elderly residents of TQA who tend them.

As a long-standing resident of Shoreham-by-Sea concerned for the ongoing wellbeing of this attractive town, I submit that, on grounds both of public policy and private amenity, this application should be rejected.

Yours truly,

Michael Charles

M.W.S. Charles (Mr.)

Flat 1, Town Quay Apartments

Town Quay

Shoreham-by-Sea

West Sussex BN43 5DS