47 Old Fort Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex BN43 5RL
27 January 2011

Adur District Council
Att. Peter Barnett
Planning and Community Division
Civic Centre
Ham Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex BN43 6PR

ADUR D.C.
CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S
DEPARTMENT
-1 FEB 2011

Dear Mr Barnett

Your Ref: ADC/0356/10

We are sending two letters relating to this proposed development. This letter deals only with design and impact issues. A second, separate letter deals with certain perceived inaccuracies in the documents related to the application.

We have examined the amended plans and the amended Design Statement and also looked more closely at the original Design and Access Statement. We are still strongly opposed both in principle and in particular to certain features of the new building with respect to several of the issues raised in our previous letter of 22 November 2010, i.e.

- Overlooking, Loss of Privacy and Light
- Design, Appearance and Character
- Traffic and Parking

Although the amendments the developers have made to address the issue of overlooking may go some way to solving the problems related to this in the original design, most of the comments we made in our previous letter still apply. Therefore, we would like to refer the planning officers to the comments we made in that letter, rather than repeat them all here. However, we will in this letter develop some of those comments and add some new ones.

If we had never seen the original design, but only the amended design, we would have made comments on the latter very similar to those we made in our previous letter. The appearance, character and scale of the building planned at No 43 are still quite different from those of most of the buildings near it.

It seems to us that the developers made the first design fairly "extreme" with the intention of amending it to something "less extreme" if people objected, so that it would be more acceptable in comparison to the original design. (We understand that this assumption was confirmed in conversation with one of the developers at an informal on-site meeting with them on 22 January.) We are therefore judging the amended design on its own merits as if the original design did not exist, rather than in comparison to the original design.

Essentially, the amended design makes the building slightly shorter and slightly lower. These changes are not sufficient to make any acceptable difference to the loss of light, either for the properties to the rear of the building in The Meadway or for the fronts of the adjacent properties at nos 41, 45 and 47 Old Fort Road and their back gardens.

The proposed building is still too large for this narrow site. It is still a massive side-boundary to side-boundary block at the rear that will cast a much larger shadow to the north than the existing building does. It still features dominant box-like structures at the front, which are now not quite as far forward or quite as high as in the original design. However, they will still have a big impact on the amount of sunlight at certain times of the day and in certain seasons on the front glazed-in porch and kitchen of no 41 and on the balconies and living rooms of nos 45 and 47 (which are designed as "upside-down" houses). The existing single-storey bungalow at no 43 has hardly any negative impact at all in this respect. The new building as amended will cause significant loss of light.

At an informal on-site meeting with the developers on 22 January, they pointed out that they had brought the building back to be in line with the front of the new building at no 37/37A. This may be the case, but there is a fundamental difference in the designs of that building and of the planned building at no 43. This difference is decisive for the amount of sunlight falling on the adjacent properties. The bottom storey of no 37/37A is set further forward than the second storey and has balconies on it. This allows

sunlight through, especially at first-floor level, which is crucial for nos 45 and 47 (see below).

It is exactly the opposite in the case of the proposed new building. Here, the fronts of the box-like structures on the second storey are set further forward than the bottom storey. In the amended design, they are in line with the front of the balconies of nos 45 and 47. This will still effectively limit the amount of sunlight falling on the adjacent properties at certain times of the day and at certain times of the year. (See the attached photo 1 and compare with the side elevations of the proposed building.)

Together with the Amended Design Statement there are some computer-generated sun path diagrams. On the basis of these, the developers claim the following in their Sun Path Report:

"From the computer sun path analysis report it is clear to see that with the new ammendments (*sic*) in place the building has no bearing impact with the amount of light the neighbouring properties receive over the seasonal year."

Such a conclusion cannot be clearly drawn at all, for two reasons:

First, there are no computer-generated diagrams showing the impact of the building with respect to light and shadow on the neighbouring properties to the rear of the building, or on the back gardens at nos 39, 41, 45 and 47 Old Fort Road. It is clear that this impact is still likely to be negative, given the dimensions and shape of the rear of the new building, in spite of the amended design.

Second, there are no diagrams showing the impact of the box-like structures at the front of the building on the amount of sunlight falling on the balconies and living rooms of nos 45 and 47 when the sun is shining from between west-south-west and west in the late afternoon and early evening between March and September. This is a particularly pleasant time of the day to enjoy the sunlight that has been one of the most attractive features of these properties since they were built in 1989. Seeing the sun go round toward the west before it sets and benefiting from its evening rays are among the reasons for our buying our house and why we like living here.

(See the attached photos 2A and 2B taken looking west from our balcony and across the balcony of no 45 for a rough idea of the obstruction to late

afternoon and evening sunlight between March and September constituted by the box-like structures at the front. From this, we hope the planning officers can visualise the negative impact on the amount and duration of sunlight falling on the balconies and into the living rooms (which are upstairs; you can see the glass doors from the living room on to the balcony in the photo) of nos 45 and 47 at the times of day and year mentioned in the preceding paragraph. The box-like structures at the front will effectively remove an outstandingly attractive feature of these properties.)

The developers also claimed at our meeting that the rear of the new building had been brought into line with the rear of the existing building at no 43 and with the rears of nos 45 and 47.

We would like to make two comments on this:

First, the rear of the main structure of the existing building at no 43 (a bungalow with a pitched roof) is considerably further forward, i.e. to the south, than the rear of the proposed side-boundary to side-boundary block, which is three-storeys high and with a flat-roof. The rear part of the old building that is in line with the rear of the new building is a low, semi-glazed-in lean-to. This difference is significant with respect to loss of light for the back gardens of nos 39, 41, 45 and 47, and for the properties in The Meadway.

Second, it is not clear to us from the original site location plan and the amended site location plan, or from the other drawings, whether the new building will be in line with the rears of nos 45 and 47 or not. The former clearly shows the rear of the new building extending further back than the rears of nos 45 and 47; the latter shows it in line with them. However, the dimensions of nos 45 and 47 seem to be different in the two site location plans, i.e. longer in the amended site location plan than in the original site location plan, thus giving the impression that the rear of the new building is in line with those of nos 45 and 47. This is confusing. If the new building does in fact extend further back than the rears of nos 45 and 47, then this is not acceptable to us, as it will negatively affect the amount of sunlight in our back garden at all times of the year.

At our informal, on-site meeting with the developers on 22 January, we understood that they would consider the comments we had made during the meeting and further amend the design. The comments in our original letter

of 22 November (which are in the main still applicable to the amended design) and in this letter refer only to the proposed design as it stands today.

We assume that any further amendments the developers make will be submitted to the Council in due course and that we will subsequently be asked formally to comment on them as part of the consultation process.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Patricia Thomas Paul Thomas



Photo 1



Photo 2A



Photo 2B