Gmail by Google

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

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1454/19

1 message

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 5 October 2019 at 15:34
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

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

Comments were submitted at 3:44 PM on 05 Oct 2019 from Mr Paul Margott.

Application Summary

Address: 2 Cypress Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6AE

Proposal: Amended plans received showing details of works to be completed under Permitted Development. Single storey rear/side (West and North) extension, side facing dormer (West) with 2no. rooflights and South facing first floor window. (East facing dormer and additional west facing dormer to be constructed under permitted development.)

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Margott

Email: [redacted]

Address: 3 Cypress Close, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6AE

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Other

Comments: Hannah Barker Paul & Elaine Margott
Development Management Section 3 Cypress Close
Adur & Worthing Councils Shoreham- By- Sea
Portland House BN43 6AE
44 Richmond Road
Worthing
BN11 1HS

4/10/2019
OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS
Your Reference AWDM/1048/19 - REJECTED Date: 03/07/2019
Your Reference AWDM/1454/19 Date: 13/09/2019
Ref. AWDM/1454/19 - "Amended Plan" Date: 25/09/2019
2 Cypress Close, Shoreham-By-Sea BN43 6AE

Following the rejection of the developer's first grossly excessive over-development and unsympathetic plan the developer has made a second application We are writing to object to this above planning application. Our objections are as follows:

AWDM/1454/19
1. This plan does not show the full intended development and is incomplete and misleading. It is clearly a cynical attempt by this developer to misrepresent the development to the adjacent residents and local community.
2. The plan misrepresents the scale of the intended development by not including the 2nd West facing Dormer or the Large 3 roomed East facing Dormer.
3. Plan drawing 7, Part First Floor Plan shows bedroom 4 only. Clearly this proves that bedrooms 1 and 2, bathroom and en-suite were already planned which could not be completed without the two large dormers later admitted to. Plans 8,9,10 and 11 do not show the dormers and are clearly intended to mislead.

AWDM/1454/19 - "Amended Plan"
1. We contend that this is not an amended plan adding further developments but the original plan that should have been submitted.
2. The developer is falsely claiming Permitted Development Rights. This has given the impression to our neighbours (like us, not familiar with planning issues) that these rights are already in place and cannot be disputed. Again part of the blatantly cynical strategy to manipulate the system and take advantage of the local residents.
3. We understand that our objections preclude PD rights to the developer "if any neighbour raises objections when they are notified of the proposal the right is then subject to a prior approval as to the impact on the amenity of adjoining premises (Town and Country Planning" (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) Explanatory Memorandum
4. That the Permitted Development rights cannot be claimed because of the following Town & Country Planning (GENERAL PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND)
- Class B/ B1. (d) - Cubic Content exceeded
- B2. (e ii) - Alteration or replacement of chimney etc.
- C2. Side elevation windows- glazed & non opening
- A1,A2, A3 various clauses
5. That the "Amended Plan" and description is still incomplete. Example - The plan and description does not clarify if the existing garage is being demolished or being kept. The existing garage wall forms part of the boundary to 3 Cypress Close, and 10 & 11 Downside close. And residents may have questions or objections that would be raised once clarified.
6. The block plan has not been updated which is needed to understand the full development.

This, because of the developer's indecent tactics so far, raises the question if there are other missing items that should be on the plan. We therefore request that a full and inclusive plan is submitted and a new notice letter sent to the neighbours and, that the sufficient extra time is given to us to consider properly the full development. Because of the enlarged box like appearance from the front we ask that this notice is sent to all residents in Cypress

Close as in the first planning application as they should have the same rights of consultation as then.

Yours Faithfully

Paul & Elaine Margott