11th March 2012

Mr Peter Barnett
Adur District Council c/o
Worthing Borough Council
Planning Section
Portland House
Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1LF

Dear Peter,

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING CHALET STYLE BUNGALOW AND REPLACEMENT WITH 2 X 3 BEDROOM SEMI DETATCHED HOUSES AT:

111 OLD FORT ROAD, SHOREHAM
PLANNING APPLICATION AWDM/0167/13

We would like to respond to the letter of objection submitted by Mr Stephen Bromley Associates Limited on behalf of the owners of 109 and 113 Old Fort Road dated 7 March 2013.

We respect neighbours rights to object. The objection is based on a number of inaccurate and unsubstantiated statements.

We will address the points raised in the same order:

Paragraph 1 to 3:
The objection confirms that the proposed houses comply with the Local Authority space standards and goes on to say*: 'generally medium sized or larger properties are expected'*

There is no policy based evidence to support this statement.

Paragraphs 4 to 6:
We refer to PPS3 for net dwelling density calculation. We have shown that the development would be at the lower end of a 'medium density'.

There is no policy based evidence to support the objection to plot density.

Recent planning decisions show that the Old Fort Road is undergoing a transition in architectural style and density. The character of the Road is varied, of various densities and changing.

Paragraphs 7 and 8:
The objection confirms *'floor areas exceed requirements'*.

We refer to Policy AH5:
'There will be a presumption in favour of the supply of dwelling units suitable for small households'

There is no policy based evidence which seeks to retain large houses.

With regard to rear gardens, the area quoted is incorrect. The southern patios should be considered part of the recreation space and the total area exceeds the requirement.

Paragraph 9 to 11:
The objectors comment *'we have seen the shadow plans: however we do not believe that these give a true representation'.*

The studies are produced by The Bionic Group (Pinewood Studios). The Bionic Group are expert in these matters and have supported the building industry in similar cases many times.

The objectors provide no evidence to support their comments.

We would correct the inaccuracy regarding the eaves. The eaves are 200mm wide and therefore 800mm from the boundary.

Development Control Standard No.2: Space Around New Dwellings and Flats shows that the dimension from the boundary to the proposed building is from the external wall, not the eaves.

One of the key objections to the previous design was the flat roof. We cannot provide a pitched roof without an eaves overhang.

We would correct the objectors comment: '*the front garden is substantially shingle. This would not comply with the Building Regulations Part M'*. The site plan shows a 1m wide path from the footpath to the front door for wheelchair access. This approach has been accepted by Adur District Council Building Control on a similar project in the Meadway.

Paragraphs 12 to 18:
We are confident that the Daylight and Sunlight animations are entirely accurate. The objector's comments can not be substantiated.

All windows to the rear elevation face north. From 1st floor windows a view over neighbouring gardens is normal.

Paragraphs 19 to 22:
Projecting eaves are a normal feature of any residential dwelling with a pitched roof.

The objectors comment; *'the plot is unsuitable for 2 units'* . We have shown that the criteria for measuring plot size and dwellings sizes has been complied with.

Paragraph 23 to 26:
With regard to our statement regarding the relative dilapidation of the existing chalet bungalow on the site; the objector's state: '*We are told by others who have seen the inside of the property*'. Evidence provided by a 3rd party should be substantiated.

Our evidence of the dilapidation of the existing house is provided by a member of the Chartered Institute of Building. The list of building fabric failures is substantial.

It is quite normal when a building is purchases that remedial works may be required at the request of the mortgage lender.

Paragraph 27:
The objectors suggest that the roof could later be converted into habitable floor space. A measurement from the top of the ceiling joist to the underside of the ridge shows that the headroom would be less than 1.8m and therefore un-usable for habitable space.

We concur with the objectors comment; *'if it is decided to grant approval, we would ask that all permitted development rights are removed'.*

Paragraph 28 to 29:
The objectors offer no policy based evidence to support their comments regarding the gaps to the boundary. We refer to Local Authority document; Development Control Standard No.2: Space Around New Dwellings and Flats.

The final sentence states *'the reason for the proposal is to make money'.*

The reason for the development is to accommodate 2 generations of the same family without placing any burden on the social housing register by the younger generation.

The objectors comments are misplaces, inaccurate and unsubstantiated.

Our statements are based upon national and local planning policy as well as design guidance.

Daylight and sunlight studies are based upon computer animation. Any time of day for any month of the year can be assessed and is available upon request.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES BRECKELL

cc. Mr and Mrs Brown