From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 27 October 2021 16:10
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/1544/21

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 27/10/2021 4:09 PM from Mr John Pitchford.

Application Summary

Address: 114 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HB

Proposal: Demolition of existing two storey house and construction of a three storey flat roofed 4 bedroom link detached dwelling with balcony at first floor and terrace at second floor south elevations and two air source heat pumps (Revised proposal)

Case Officer: Marie O'Keeffe

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr John Pitchford

Address: 11 Godfrey's Wood, Melton IP12 1QY

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Overdevelopment
- Privacy Light and Noise

Comments: Further to our previous comments in respect of application AWDM1544/21 on behalf of Mr and Mrs M Pitchford of 116 Old Fort Road, Shoreham by Sea, sent on 16 September and 8 October 2021, we are responding to the proposed modifications submitted by the applicants on 14 October 2021.

We welcome the changes made by the applicant, in particular the move of the whole structure back by 1m. However, we remain with the following concerns:

The overall height has been reduced, but only by the total of 200mm (approximately 8 inches). It still is significantly overshadowing the adjacent properties (Nos. 116 and 112) and is out of scale with these. While cases have been quoted of other differences in height along the sea front, these are either not of the scale seen in this

proposal or have a wider space around them such that they do not dominate to the same extent. As an example, the development of No.98 Old Fort Road shows a much clearer respect for its adjacent lower neighbour (No.96) by stepping back the higher upper storey away from that side. The same is evident in the recent appeal decision at No.66 Old Fort Road (AWDM/1085/20), referred to in the applicant's Design and Access Statement, where the Inspector noted that the tiered design of the scheme would ensure that the spaciousness and open character of the area would be retained. While the architect for No.114 has described the reasons for wishing to have the height, this does not make the scale of the development any less impactful on the neighbours or the wider environment and there appears to be no attempt to respond to the lower heights of the adjacent buildings by use of design. As such, we continue to consider that the application would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Local Plan.

We now have more information about on the nature of the side screen to the balcony at first floor level. While this will obscure some views, it does not provide full screening from views of the garden below. Probably of more concern though is the absence of screening from the terrace at second floor level, which is likely to be used more regularly given the nature of the adjacent rooms. While the move of the balustrade back by 1.5m will, to some extent, mitigate the issue of overlooking of No.116's garden, visualisations show that there will still be loss of privacy in this situation. Consideration should be given to the approach in a comparable case at 144 Old Fort Road where it was a condition of the planning application (AWDM/0876/11 and 0878/12) that obscured glass screens should be applied to the sides of the terraces of the proposal. This was to comply with the then local plan policies which are broadly consistent with the current Policy 15. Equally, in the recent appeal decision for No.66 Old Fort Road quoted above, the Inspector, in allowing the development, insisted on privacy screens for the ends of the balconies and obscured glazing on side windows.

J Pitchford BA, DipTP, MRTPI
on behalf of Mr & Mrs M Pitchford, 116 Old Fort Road

Kind regards