Gmail

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

APPLICATION AWDM/1492/24

1 message

christopher dodd [redacted] 9 December 2024 at 17:32

To: "planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Cc: "info@taarchitects.co.uk" <info@taarchitects.co.uk>

For the PERSONAL ATTENTION of Director of Planning, Adur & Worthing Council.

I regret to have to write to you in this fashion. I Object to your Officer requiring the re-design of part of the above development in New Road, Shoreham on the, apparently 'legal' grounds that redesign is required by some person of some authority in your Office due to its previous design not being acceptable by being 'different' from 'unspecified' neighbouring properties. Please confirm how this can be legally justified?

In support of the applicant's original application -

1. I reject Adur/Worthing's assumed right to dictate design decisions to this land-owner/applicant;
2. I object to this L.A.'s assumption that it has - A. the right to insinuate it has either this right or - B. that it has the slightest architecture based qualification to dictate taste & cultural assumptions about original designs submitted to it ;
3. If I am incorrect in my two statements above please confirm those actual Architectural Reputational Qualifications in writing to me by return;
4. As I do not expect to receive this from you I would suggest the following - C. your withdraw your Objections on the basis of the actual, 'less-than-significant' size & content of the Application concerned or - D. you at least offer an properly argued rebuttal of 1 & 2 above.
5. I also suggest that the Authority which employs you to make supportable decisions of cultural, qualitative &/or seriously economically disruptive matters, will be sufficiently responsible, in transaction terms, to "put its cultural-stance where its mouth is". At best your decision, delaying this tiny application, is culturally unsupportable, disruptive & therefore very difficult to understand. I do not believe there is any significant - so-called - townscape or economic harm' from this, at best insignificant, development. A development which, even a planning officer should understand, does no actual harm but which needs to end up satisfying the progressive & economical terms of the property owner.
6. It also remains critically important that all Authorities, such as this, should support the entirely justifiable right of owners/companies to design & construct housing to express the character and technical abilities of the Twentyfirst Century. And in a Zone of at best 'mixed generic construction containing no recognisable area characteristic', it is the Planning Authority's responsibility to support, NOT OBJECT TO, designs considered to be 'timely' & contemporary.
7. I therefore formally request that the Objection to the originally submitted design be immediately recommended for APPROVAL.

In summary - it remains my enthusiastic opinion that we will all benefit from the acceptance of genuine contemporary design as a reflection of the continuing advances in building ability, design of advances and genuine advances in technology which when properly applied by professional Architects WILL progressively improve the quality of place-making and the standard of living of the peoples of this Country.

Yours Christopher Dodd BA Arch (Lond) RIBA (rtd)