1666/2.1/REVA

24th September 2018

Marie O'Keeffe
Senior Planning Officer
Adur & Worthing Councils
Planning Services
Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing West Sussex
BN11 1HS

Dear Marie,

**Re: Removal of the existing roof over the eastern part of the single storey bungalow and an extension to form a 1st floor living space and kitchen with a balcony and privacy screens over the eastern end of the building and associated alterations on 158 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HL, Council Ref: AWDM/0784/18**

Following the practice's letter of 19th July 2018, Mr & Mrs Cook asked the practice to review the latest amendments and provide further information to re-consider the above application and whether it will continue to have an impact on their home. Our client, the owner occupier of 160 Old Fort Road, Shoreham Beach, West Sussex, BN43 5HL will be directly affected by the applicant's proposal. We therefore maintain our objection and expect these comments to be given the weight they clearly deserve – the main issues are still the impact on direct sunlight, the underwhelming design and the significant impact on the occupants' privacy and the sense of enclosure caused by the first-floor balcony and gable end. This is regretful but important as the outcome (of an approval) will have a lasting and deleterious impact on our client's welfare and state of mind.

**Daylight and over-shadowing**

We are pleased to confirm that there is no objection to the technical issue of 'loss of daylight' following our lighting expert's appraisal of the proposals against the existing. As you are aware, the two things are difference. As such we do still aver our Client's previous comments about the unacceptable shadow cast on their south facing windows. In our opinion this could be mitigated by moving the building's proposed first floor extension westwards (which is a simple procedure).

**Privacy**

The balcony must be pulled away from the north-eastern corner in our opinion – standing on the balcony will give new and unwanted views from the proposals into our client's home – directly. Screening or an enclosure could be used to enliven this aspect of the design. Screening on the balcony could lead to further direct shadowing however, as above, by making the balcony mainly southerly (as opposed to running full-length along the eastern and southern boundaries), this can be mitigated. Historically, the Council had insisted that my client's balcony was enclosed to avoid similar issues – however this was on a raised ground floor level i.e. not at first floor. It is important therefore to ensure that the existing relationship between sites is maintained and certainly not worsened.

**Design**

As per our earlier statements, the design creates the issues we believe are the cause of our client's distress. Namely the austere blank façade does little to benefit our client's view or experience of their external spaces. With articulation some relief could be found in a similar bulk but presented differently; as above, by pushing the first floor

to the west, our client would benefit hugely as it effectively deals with the bulk of the issue. The design is still blander than need be and creates a harsh adjunct to its neighbour which is entirely unnecessary.

**Conclusion**

Mr & Mrs Cook asked the practice to review the latest amendments and provide further information that assists them to make proper and concise representation. Frustratingly, they have asked to uphold their objection and strengthen it on the basis that no mitigation has been offered concerning:

- The reduction in direct sunlight to our client's ground floor windows during the winter months and;
- The blandness of the design of the first-floor gable and its impact on our client's amenity due to its bearing and;
- The position of the first-floor gable being easternmost on the footprint of the original house i.e. the most impacting point and;
- The balcony which causes a loss of privacy and direct views into the neighbouring property/our client's home.

As such we believe that the application should be refused or withdrawn until a more considerate scheme is submitted with only a negligible impact to our client's home.

Please contact us if you have any questions at all.

Yours,

[redacted]

Liam Russell BA (HONS) DIP ARCH RIBA MIoD
Managing Director