Stephen Bromley Associates Limited

Chartered Building Surveyors

5 West Street, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5WF.
Tel: Shoreham-by-Sea ([redacted]
Email: s[redacted]

Development Control
Adur District Council
Civic Centre
Ham Rd
Shoreham by Sea
West Sussex

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED [illegible] 2012
TO
INSTRUCTION WBL

Dear Sirs
Re: planning application No AWDM/1406/12 111 Old Fort Road.

We have been asked by our clients, the owners of No's 109 &113 Old Fort Road To look at this application. We have inspected the planning documents and have had to advise our clients that the affect on their buildings would be substantial

Following discussions with my clients they have asked me to put forward my concerns, I therefore report as follows.

1. The site is only suitable for one property. To install two would be out of character with this part of the road. The other houses in this section are all detached single dwelling houses.

2. None of the houses included in the planing history none of the examples provided by the applicants agent is near this Property and I note that the consent for No. 77 dates from 1992.

3. At the base of page 3 of the design and access statement there is a comment about recent developments of dilapidated bungalows that have come to the end of their useful life which can be positively redeveloped to provide additional housing. The above comment appears to suggest that 111 Old Fort Road comes into the same category as the other properties which have been redeveloped.

4. This is not the case. The bungalows that have been redeveloped are all those of non-standard construction and which cannot be economically upgraded. They are properties which are unmortgageable.

5. 111 Old Fort Road is of standard construction and does not come into that category.

6. The photo at the base of page 3 purports to show similar developments. However that is clearly not the case. The nearer site is of standard design and has a low ridge with a first floor being part in the roof space. The third site although having 3 stories has the third floor completely in the roof space and part of the first floor also in the roof space. Thus the height

has been kept down as low as possible and the ridge/ highest corner is away from the adjacent buildings.. The site between is of only two storeys with a flat roof, rather than the three storeys suggested for this development.

7. The plot width of the proposal is around 12.5m Where as the smallest plot width of the three sites mentioned above is around 16m

8. At the bottom of the page it says that there is no change of use. There is however a significant change of density and reduction in open space around the building.

9. On page 7, Appraisal of Context, they state that Old Fort Road is going through the modest transformation where single houses are frequently redeveloped as two. However, they do not mention that those properties which have been redeveloped are of non-standard construction and on extra wide sites. As mentioned above The smallest of the site mentioned in my paragraph 7 is 3.5m wider than this site.

10. The design is clearly a matter of personal choice, but we do not believe it fits in with this immediate area.

11. the plan R1059 from Acad Mapping clearly shows that the ridge of the existing building is lower than the proposal and it is well away from adjacent properties.

12. Turning to plan 01, this shows that the proposed building is significantly higher than the existing building and substantially higher than the properties either side. The height scaled from the plan is approximately 8.5 metres as compared to a 7 metre height to 109 and a 7.7 metre height to 113.

13. The site is around 12.5 metres wide. The building is only 1 metre from the boundaries to a height of 5.25 metres and only 1.7 metres from the boundary from there to 8.5 metres.

14. This compares to the ridge of the existing property which is around 7 metres from no. 113 and a little further from 109.

15. We accept that the footprint is a similar distance from no. 113, but only at ground floor level, at higher levels it slopes away from the adjacent properties. The proposed building is about half the distance from the boundary with 109 than that existing. The existing building takes up approximately a third of the depth of the site and has a footprint of around 97 square Metres. The proposed property takes somewhat more than a third of the site and has a footprint of 136 square metres.

16. We note that previous applications for alterations to 113 have been turned down on the basis that the design does not match in with the surrounding properties and that the ridge was lifted to a marginal degree. This proposal goes far beyond the alterations which were turned down for No 113

17. Whilst there are contemporary buildings on the north side of Old Fort Road they are not in this part of the road and they are in keeping with regard to the size. The houses around this proposal are all traditional with pitched roofs.

18. The proposal is effectively slab sided and out of keeping with regard to the immediate area in respect of design and height.

19. The comments regarding the design are quite effusive, but apart from the colour have no connection with the sea or boats that we can see.

20. Of great concern is the direct affect on the adjoining properties.

21. It can be seen that the pitched roof of the existing unit allows for sunshine to go over the top with only a minimal affect on the two adjacent properties.

22. The relevant part of the proposed building would be within 2 metres of each boundary compared to the ridge of the existing, which is approximately 6 metres from the boundary of 113 and 7 metres from the boundary of 109.

23. A 30 degree line down from the ridge of the original property would hardly go above the west boundary fence of no. 113 and would not reach the top of the boundary fence of 109.

24. A 30 degree sunshine line from the relative part of the proposed building would extend right across the plot of 113 and right across the back garden of 109. Thus 113 would have no sunshine in the rear garden from approximately 2pm until 6pm, whilst that area immediately at the back of 113 would not get any sunshine at all. With regard to 109, they would get no sunshine in the rear garden until after 11am. Clearly in both instances there is a major affect.

25. In addition the design clearly overshadows both neighbouring properties and they would effectively be faced with a blank white wall extending straight up for around eight and a half metres.

26. There are windows in the two sides which will allow the occupants to look straight down into the gardens of the adjacent properties.

27. Turning to the design, it is clear that the accommodation has been squeezed in with the living room of a four bedroomed property measuring only 4.5 metres by 3 metres.

28. The rear gardens of the properties are only around 65 square metres whereas the development control standard no. 2 (Space around buildings) requires a rear garden area for a four bedroomed property of at least 100 square metres.

29. Section 3.2 gives a minimum rear garden depth of 11m for a two storey house and by interpolation of section 2.10 14m for a three storey house. In this instance there is only 10m.

30. Section 3.8 requires that adjacent properties are not overshadowed and that they should not extend beyond the rear wall of the neighbours. As mentioned above this will have a significant effect on the light of the adjacent owners. Thus this application does not satisfy the Council's regulations in a number of respects.

31. Even if the top storey was removed the proposal would not be acceptable because of the effect it would have on the adjacent properties and for a number of the other reasons mentioned above, design, garden etc.

[redacted]

Stephen Bromley Associates

[redacted]

9852.039
6 December 2012