PLANNING APPEAL Y3805/W/23/3330594
LAND SOUTH OF 4 WILMOT ROAD, SHOREHAM BY SEA, BN43 6BN.

Response to Planning officers' statement.

I will avoid repeating my previous representations as far as possible.

NB: I will follow the numbering as before.

1a If a purchaser is unhappy about overlooking, they will not buy the property.
I note that the owners of no 4 Wilmot Road bought the house despite the planning officer suggesting in their responses that it has a 'sub-standard' garden.

1b Adur council have recently built properties where adjacent houses overlook the gardens etc in much the same way as this proposal. To say that their proposal is by way of a 'holistic redevelopment' does not change the situation.

It would be bad enough if they gave a developer such consent, but to give it to themselves and then give it as a reason to refuse elsewhere is unacceptable.

3 The current garage is on residential land, not part of the garage compound behind and it is clearly incorrect to say that the comparison with the site 123-139 Wilmot Road is tenuous.

4 The access to the property is of no great length and virtually unused. I have been to the site on many occasions and never seen a car or person on it.

Whilst there is a garage compound behind, few if any of the tenants use this on a daily basis. The planning officer is vastly over stating the safety aspect to try and reinforce their case.

Also, the adjacent houses in Hammy Lane have access onto this area and it is not considered as a safety concern for them.

Similarly, people accessing the garage compound must use this access and there seems no undue concern about their safety.

5.

6. The planning officer has ignored the development on Wembley Road where the site is no bigger. Also, the fact that several of the gardens on that 'Holistic development' 123-139 Wilmot Road are smaller than this proposal.

I do not see how the planning officer can state that the development 123 – 139 Wilmot Road has good privacy provisions when as I have already shown they have built properties that are directly overlooked.

They talk about disabled parking on site, we have parking right next to the property with level access.
7.
8.
9.
10.

11. I wonder whether the people surrounding the 123-139 Wilmot Road site consider the removal of the garages behind disrupting the 'homogeneity of the area'

The proposal is for a domestic unit on domestic land and not a fundamental change.

Re the suggestion of a risk to 'quiet enjoyment' the situation here is no worse and probably better than with a house next door, where they could be using tools within 2 or 3 m of the back of the house.

Also, a new house is unlikely to have a requirement for much DIY.

With regard to Coventry V Lawrence 2014, how anyone can compare a 2-bedroom bungalow with a speedway racetrack is beyond me. The planning also appears to have the sides the wrong way around. This only reinforces the suggestion that the council are trying to stop this for other reasons. I would not be surprised if this were to facilitate their own construction on the garage compound behind as they have already done with similar LA owned compounds. It is well known that the Adur housing department are looking for such sites. Indeed, when I used to undertake the 'right to buy' valuations on council houses for Adur council I was specifically asked to look out for such sites.

12.
13.
14.
15.
16.

17. This has been covered earlier, but just how many movements a day can 1 bungalow create.

As mentioned also this is the same access to the compound which could potentially have more users and they are not concerned about their safety.

These are Adur owned garages rented out. If they were concerned about safety, they could have refused to rent them or put in a path.

Re 2 Wembley Avenue.

We accept that there may be more light to that property. However, we can put in roof light windows to the south elevation of the proposed bungalow with a vaulted ceiling internally which would provide additional light to the adequate provision already made without affecting or overlooking anyone, or indeed without being looked into by anyone. A revised plan is attached to cover this.

With regard to waste collection, we are only talking about taking a bin the length of a normal house, or the waste lorry could drive in and collect as it does to the back of Britannia House in High Street Shoreham where the access is of similar width.

As too the over emphasis of safety for deliveries etc, Adur Council are not unduly concerned about the pedestrians accessing the garages.

Most properties in Wilmot Road use the street for parking for residents and visitors, this is not significant.

Finally, they have ignored the fact that the property at 2 Wembley Avenue does not match any of the local environment and is something of an eyesore.

Site 123- 139 Wilmot Road

The comments are mainly nonsense and not relevant, the site would have gone ahead whatever the neighbours said.

Much of what has been included in the Planning Officers Statement appears to be there to confuse the Inspector only

The changes to the layout of 123 – 139 Wilmot Road site did not move the adjacent property any further away from the dwelling in Buci Crescent.

The Planning officer again appears to have the situation the wrong way around in talking about installing obscured, non-opening glazing to protect the neighbours. There is no question of our proposed development overlooking anyone or taking anyone's view.

Conclusion

Despite what the Planning Officer contends the LA have decided for whatever reason that they do not want this bungalow and are using superfluous reasons for trying to obstruct it.

There is a large paragraph re the difficulties that an older person would have suggesting that the bungalow is ½ a mile up an unmade road, not just the length of a normal house from the main road.

The talk about 'gung-Ho 'approach to planning re overlooking is rich when they have given themselves approval to do the same on the 1233- 139 Wilmot Road site.

They give approval for an ugly inappropriate at Wembley Avenue and then seek to try and find anything they can wrong with this proposal

To compare this bungalow with a speedway racing circuit is ludicrous and just shows the lengths they are going to, to try and stop this.

They have in their report got the situation with Coventry v Lawrence 2014 the wrong way around.

This proposal has no adverse effect on anyone, and we only expect to be treated the same way as the council treat the applications for their own Housing department.

The refusal may not be an arbitrary decision, but it is certainly not reasoned, considered and justified.

Stephen W Bromley

12114
15th April 2024