From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 27 September 2022 12:14
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1470/22

Flag Status: Flagged

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/09/2022 12:14 PM from Ms Jennifer Claire Pulling.

Application Summary

Address:	13 Queens Place Shoreham-by-sea West Sussex BN43 5AA
Proposal:	Proposed single storey side infill/rear extension, front and rear roof lights. Amended resubmission of previously refused AWDM/0795/22
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Jennifer Claire Pulling
Address:	15 Queens Place, Shoreham-by-sea, West Sussex BN43 5AA

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:	This is a thinly disguised version of a planning application, which has previously been turned down for a number of significant reasons. Thus, every objection I have made to the applicant's previous attempts to have his application approved apply. As a long term resident of Queens Place I and my neighbours (14 and 16) have loved and respected the special charm of this street. Its Victorian cottages are a focal point of Shoreham and much admired. Now it appears that this application, if approved, would be a travesty of the Conservation Area and its planning rules. It would also create a precedent for future applications, thus devastate Queens

Place not to mention other streets in the Conservation Area.
Previously, the applicant was one of those who voiced his objections to the 31 Buckingham Road (AWDM/2274/21) I quote: 'the street would be disturbed for a long time, with skips, scaffolding, builders etc. I think this would be unfair on all the residents. The scale, form and design of the proposal are out of keeping with Queens Place and would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. The flat roof, boxy design, proportions do not reflect the traditional character of houses resulting in significant harm to visual amenity. The proposal would be a dominant and visually intrusive addition that fails to reflect the character of the existing buildings and the prevailing character of the area.'
Overall the applicant's proposal is far too large and totally out of character with neighbouring houses and the Conservation area. Extension to the suggested scale would create a very large slab visible from many gardens negatively affecting residents' amenities, in particular those closest to it. It would especially impact the garden of number 14 where it would dominate the view to the south. My own back garden's light levels (no 15) would be impacted.

There is also the subject of greatly reducing the size of the applicant's garden, which is contrary to Development Control Standards. Such a loss of garden space would create a reduction of rain run-off. I would question the capability of the drainage and sewage system to cope with the inevitable increase in flow. It is probable Southern Water would insist on extensive (and disruptive) work. Not only that, but any future residents of 13 Queens Place would be given no choice but to possess a garden. Environmentally, this insidious destruction of natural habitat would, no doubt have its impact.
Queens Place is a small street where even short-term deliveries are difficult. Such significant works carried out for this overdevelopment would cause large disruption to neighbours. The only rear access is the twitten, which is not only used by 10 houses but provides the sole rear exit in the case of fire. How does this planning application enable us continued free passage?
The street also suffers from parking congestion. I would point out that, by adding this considerably larger living space, extra vehicles both during the works and foreseeably in the future would be untenable.
Number 13's application should be refused on the many points mentioned above, being totally out of scale and character for Queen's Place and adversely affecting residents' quality of life and amenities.

Kind regards