Oxen Court, Oxen Avenue, Shoreham by Sea, BN43 5AS AWDM/1324/21 | Proposed upward extension to form 4 no. flats within an additional floor to blocks 1 and 2 (2 x 1 bedroom flats and 2 x 2 bedroom flats); resurfacing and reconfiguration of existing car park to form 9no. parking spaces (amended resubmission of AWDM/0250/21)

ARCHITECTS RESPONSE TO ADUR AND WORTHING DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (AWDM) LETTER DATED 13 APRIL 2022 ADDRESSED TO THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE (MR TERRY SCOTT)

YOUR REFERENCE APP/Y/3805/W/21/3287021

Dear Mr Scott,

I would like to address the few points AWDM have made in response to the Architects Appeal Statement:

Paragraph 5: Shoreham Airport – 3km of an aerodrome

The point that we are making here is that Brighton City Airport was: *'satisfied that the proposed application as submitted is unlikely to have any impact on the safe operation of the airport'*. Therefore, if the authority on aviation (Brighton City Airport) was satisfied, it is a material consideration that the government have enabled upward extensions through PD.

Paragraph 6: Citing Swanborough Court, New Road APP/Y/3805/W/20/3262318

The reasons for refusing an upward extension of Swanborough Court were:

The proposed extension would result in an unacceptable and harmful increase in height, scale and bulk and result in an unduly prominent building which partially obscures views of the tower of the Church of St Mary de Haura and which fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The increased height, scale and bulk is likely to result in an increased loss of light to existing neighbouring properties and the application has failed to provide a daylight and sunlight assessment to enable a qualified assessment of this issue.

The appeal site is not in a Conservation Area, cannot be viewed in relation to Church of St Mary de Haura and has not been refused for reasons of daylight and sunlight.

Paragraph 6 Continued: Citing Penhill Court, Penhill Road, APP/Y3805/21/3278230

It is a ridiculous suggestion to cite the appeal decision of Penhill Court as relevant to this appeal. The design proposal for Penhill Court was an upward extension of 2 full storeys over an existing 3 storey building. The resultant building, if approved would have been a 5 storey apartment building next to single storey housing.

I agree that it was right to dismiss both these appeals but draw attention to there being no similarity between the design proposals therein and this appeal.

Paragraph 7: '*NPPF – support opportunities to use airspace etc, consistent with the prevailing height and form etc:*

The Architects Appeal Statement demonstrates 7 examples within walking distance of the appeal site, that are not in a Conservation Area, as the appeal site and where 3 storey buildings sit happily next to 2 storey neighbours.

Summary:

Citing those appeal decision for Swanborough Court and Penhill Court as having some relevance to this appeal is unreasonable.

We invite the Planning Inspectorate to inspect those applications through the Local Authority planning public access system to see how far detached those designs are from this appeal development.

As per the delegated refusal, introducing spurious evidence at this stage is unreasonable.

Once again, we respect the view of the Inspector in all outcomes.

Yours sincerely,

James Breckell - Architect