

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0445/26

Reps and Consults



planning@adur-worth Sun 17 May, 16:47 (3 days ago)

to me

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 17/05/2026 4:47 PM from Ms Claire Summersby.

Application Summary

Address: 16 Elm Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 1PG

Proposal: Change of use from dwellinghouse (Class C3) to large house in multiple occupation (Sui Generis); demolition of side store and construction of single storey side extension; conversion of roofspace including front rooflights

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Ms Claire Summersby

Email:

Address: 17 Elm Road Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Design
- Highway Access and Parking
- Loss of General Amenity
- Other
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: I object to planning application AWDM/0445/26 for the proposed change of use from a dwelling house (Class C3) to a large House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis), together with the demolition of the side store, construction of a single-storey side extension, and roof space conversion including front roof lights.

My objections are as follows:

1. Harm to the Conservation Area

The property is located within a designated conservation area and the proposal conflicts with the requirement to preserve or enhance its character and appearance. The proposed roof lights/windows and associated alterations are not sympathetic to the architectural character of surrounding properties and would result in visual harm to the conservation area.

Under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special attention must be paid to preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of conservation areas. This proposal fails to satisfy that statutory duty.

2. Conflict with Local and National Planning Policy

The proposal appears contrary to the Adur and Worthing planning policies and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to promote balanced and mixed communities and avoid excessive concentrations of a single housing type, including HMOs.

The existing concentration of HMOs in the area is already significant, with traditional family housing becoming increasingly limited. Approving another large HMO would further undermine the balance and sustainability of the local community.

3. Overconcentration of HMOs and Loss of Family Housing

There are already a large number of HMOs in the surrounding area, resulting in an imbalance in the local housing stock. The continued loss of family dwellings to intensive HMO use harms community cohesion and changes the established residential character of the neighbourhood.

The proposal would contribute to the cumulative erosion of balanced residential housing and could set an undesirable precedent for further HMO conversions in the area.

4. Impact on Vulnerable Residents and Community Stability

The current housing mix in the area is already under strain. Further concentration of HMOs risks undermining the rehabilitation and wellbeing of vulnerable residents and weakens the stability of the residential community by reducing the availability of long-term family accommodation.

5. Noise, Disturbance and Loss of Residential Amenity

A large HMO would generate substantially greater levels of noise, activity, comings and goings, and general disturbance than a single-family dwelling. Occupants are likely to maintain differing schedules, increasing late-night movement and activity which would negatively affect neighbouring residents. The intensified occupation would materially harm the residential amenity and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring homes.

6. Crime and Community Safety Concerns

The proposal raises concerns regarding increased anti-social behaviour and crime within the immediate area. The neighbourhood already experiences pressures associated with high-density occupation, and this development risks exacerbating those issues further.

7. Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking Pressure

The intensified use of the property is likely to increase vehicle ownership, visitor traffic, deliveries, servicing, and on-street parking demand. Local roads already

experience parking stress and congestion.

Additional pressure on parking and vehicle movements could create highway safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users, particularly within a densely occupied residential area.

8. Refuse, Waste, Odours and Visual Impact

Insufficient information has been provided regarding refuse and recycling storage arrangements for a large HMO. The scale of occupation proposed is likely to generate excessive waste, smells, bin storage issues, and visual clutter detrimental to neighbouring amenity and the street scene.

9. Design, Appearance and Overdevelopment

The proposed side extension and roof alterations appear excessive and unsympathetic to the character of the existing property and surrounding area. The cumulative scale and intensity of development would result in an overdeveloped site that is out of keeping with the established residential pattern within the conservation area.

10. Overlooking, Privacy and Loss of Light

The proposed roof alterations and additional accommodation may result in overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The extensions and roof lights also have the potential to reduce natural light and adversely affect neighbouring residential amenity.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that Adur & Worthing Councils refuse planning application AWDM/0445/26.
