

From: **Philip Navier**

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2025 at 21:51

Subject: Re: 45 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea AWDM/002/25

To: Hannah Barker <hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

I don't think that the argument about footprints is reflecting that the upper storey of this building will breach the 22 metre standard. Following the footprint argument any development could balloon outwards from the upper storey to any size they like and what a precedent that would make? There would be no purpose to having Development Management Standards. If they want to develop the property then the building needs to be completed in accordance with the Development Management Standards. You can talk all you like about obscuring glazing but the reality is that immediately planning permission is granted the Council will take no responsibility for a future change to clear glass.

It took me a lot of time and effort to get the plan for the development immediately behind me to meet the 22 metre standard and someone now expects me to not be concerned about the 22 metre minimum.

The fact that the property now seeking development permission is closer than 22 metres does not create a precedent.

19 Dec 2017 · Two recent decisions in the High Court have now emphasised the importance of consistency in planning decisions and the need for clear reasons to be given where inconsistencies arise.

The consistency should be that the Development Management Standards are respected. The new plans need to respect the 22 metre standard. If that means a bit more demolition beyond what the developers expected then that is a price they must be obliged to pay to bring matters back to the Development Management Standards.

There is a lot of talk about Shoreham Beach having an open aspect. If you want to see what an open aspect looks like look at the bungalows along the school end of Cheal Close. By allowing the gaps between properties to be forever closed off by permitting the upward and sideward growth of properties you wall off the sun. Behind me was a bungalow and now there's a block house. This block house mentality has taken over Old Fort Road and is walling off the views from The Meadway. Perhaps the open aspect of Shoreham Beach needs to be properly protected.

Philip Navier

On Tue, 29 Apr 2025, 17:00 Hannah Barker, <hannah.barker@adur-worthing.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Navier,

Thank you for your letters which have been published as representations in relation to the above, current planning application. We are currently awaiting some amendments to the application submission correcting the scale/errors on the plans and seeking some changes to the front balcony. We have also received a street scene image to show the relative building heights to help with the assessment.

Amendments will be updated on the council's website so you can view the current updates there as you wish. We will notify adjacent neighbours when amended plans are received. Full consideration will be given to the representations made in relation to this application.

The proposal is for a fully flat roof development, the ridge is to be removed. A front balcony extension is proposed infilling and increasing the footprint to the front. The submitted plans show this. The footprint to the rear is to remain the same, the building will be no closer to the rear boundary than is currently the case.

Sheet 1 (as you refer) shows the existing hipped roof, dormer and sun terrace, sheet 2 (as you refer) shows the side elevation of this, this is how the building is shown in elevational form and this is a correct representation.

Whilst we are still considering some changes and negotiating with the agent I can respond to your points. The flat roof development will increase the scale of development however in terms of street scene this particular contemporary proposal will not appear out of keeping. You refer to Right to Light, as advised with the previous application in 2011 this is not a planning matter but a civil matter between landowners which could be pursued privately whether or not planning permission is granted. It is not considered that there would be significant loss of light to your property to warrant a refusal in this case.

The distance between the rear of your property, no. 39 and the rear of the existing building is 19.7 metres. The building already exists at this distance from you. The 22 metre standard which you are referring to is set out in Development Management Standards as a guide to stipulate a minimum distance between two storey buildings, back to back. A distance of 22 metres is the minimum required between principle facing windows in order to retain privacy. In this case the building exists at less than this distance and there is a clearly glazed window. We must consider the existing situation, the new windows to the rear will be obscurely glazed, therefore no overlooking will occur here, i.e. the situation will be improved from existing. It is not considered that there will be an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed development.

Should permission be granted we would seek to add a condition to remove any permitted development rights so no further additions can be added without prior approval from the planning authority.

I hope that this information is of help, please could you confirm receipt of this email and I will inform you of any further amendments.

Yours sincerely,

Hannah Barker

Hannah Barker

Senior Planning Officer, Planning & Development

01903 221475

Adur & Worthing Councils

Portland House
[Richmond Road](#)
[Worthing](#)
[West Sussex](#)
[BN11 1HH](#)
<http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk>

