From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 21 September 2022 15:38
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application NOTICE/0021/22

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/09/2022 3:38 PM from Mr Stephen Lockwood.

Application Summary

Address:	Healthlink House The Annexe Southwick Street Southwick West Sussex BN42 4TE
Proposal:	Application for Prior Approval of Proposed Change of use from Commercial, Business and Service (Use Class E) to form 1no. 4 bedroom residential unit (Use Class C3).
Case Officer:	Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Stephen Lockwood
Address:	27 Glebe Close, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex BN42 4TF

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	We at 27 Glebe Close Object to this application for Change of use to residential on the following grounds. 1) This presumably will pave the way for the full redevelopment of the Michaelmas & Prefab land and we are very concerned, based on the previous applications made (thankfully rejected) that this will be detrimental to the houses surrounding this land, the many trees located in this area and the Southwick Conservation area. 2) The application states that the Annex or Healthlink House has been vacant for 3 months. That is not true. Both I and my neighbours have seen people smoking outside and cars parked outside only a month ago. As I see it, the fact that they have been moved out now does not change the loss of employment opportunity issue.

3) As I see it this Prefab cannot possibly meet all the regulations for a dwelling. Fire risk, Windows/Ventilation, insulation and with no outdoor space in front and just a few square feet of yard out back it is totally inappropriate for a four bedroom dwelling.

4) The yard out back of this Prefab is only a few metres away from the decking/patio areas of 26 and 27 Glebe Close so the noise disturbance of such a small area filled with occupants of a four bedroom house would be considerable. The owners of 26/27 are elderly.

5) When the previous application was rejected (AWDM/1350/19), it clearly stated that the back of the dwelling should be at least 11 metres from the boundry to the neighbouring houses. Surely this would also apply in this case. It is not a new building but it is a new dwelling.

6) Although you have assured me that, should this be approved, it could not be rented out as an HMO, I am still concerned that it could be rented and rooms sub let to get round the rules.

I would request that you visit 27 Glebe Close so that you can see for yourself just how inappropriate this is.

Steve Lockwood & Penny Peters

Kind regards