Adur & Worthing Councils
Development Management
Portland House
44, Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1HS

ADUR & WORTHING
- 3 MAY 2018
PLANNING SERVICES

Planning Services Manager, Gary Peck.
Ref: AWDM/0251/18: 43 OFR., Shoreham-by-Sea.

May 1st, 2018

Dear Mr Peck, AMENDMENTS to Plan

We acknowledge the advised amendment that alters the parking arrangements for 43 Old Fort Rd, and also that the scheme is being reduced to 2 x two-bed semi-detached dwellings rather than 2 x three-bed as we suggested previously.

But, apparently the reduction in accomodation from three bedrooms to two, has made made no difference to either the mass, height nor exterior design of the original scheme that can be seen to extend beyond the footprint of the original chalet demolished in 2015. Surely now, the two side canopies in the first plan are surplus to requirements and we suggest their removal would allow unencumbered access for high-sided vehicles over the common shared-drive/ROW as previously suggested.

All our other concerns previously listed in our correspondence dated March 23rd, 2018, continue to play on our minds, especially the location of 43's front door opening onto a shared vehicular/pedestrian Right of Way! This is bound to cause some potentially serious issues in the future if it is not addressed at this planning stage.

Under item 4 – Light, in our first letter, we explain our further concerns. With 43's current scheme, placed both higher and further forward towards Old Fort Road than the previous chalet, our current light from the East will be compromised. We have two kitchen windows along that side and a single-window bathroom. Our East-side light will now be under threat much like that we continue to suffer from 39's height and mass on our West side. The levels and hours of direct light we once enjoyed in the past on both sides will now unfairly diminish. And, our chalet has been here since 1920?

Four years ago, 39 Old Fort Road, after its intial scheme had been refused by the Planning Inspectorate, the

current detached scheme was approved. With that, the owner respected matters such as minimum size for rear gardens and the required 22 metres distance of facing principal windows to ensure privacy. But, as previously described, 39's current mass, height and design has adversely affected our rear garden causing more shade during the Summer months than we had been previously used to.

Surely, the Committee must see that we are, therefore, equally concerned by similar effects being repeated by the scheme for 43 OFR. Frankly, our amenities have, and may be further, denied on both sides of our property and we feel this is unjust.

In this vane, we ask if Planning Committee has sought Sun/shadowing projections from 43's architect that should show the likely future effects of 43's new scheme. We could then see the effects of the build's shading effects during various months, times of day etc. This data would be useful for us and our neighbours who are equally likely to be affected.

But added to this, another effect that had not occurred to us prior to 39's new build affects us regularly – wind roar! The driveways to our either side are South-facing. Our chalet was one of a row of four when we purchased in 2006. So, roaring then had little or no effect as each bungalow was essentially the same shape, height and attitude. But, being potentially "squeezed" between two higher, slab-sided masses, we are even more concerned about the venturi-effect of increasing velocity of wind being forced through the small gaps between buildings on both sides increasing noise along the length of each driveway. Even at a wind speed of only 18mph, we notice roar. We need to be re-assured that this effect will not cause extra noise affecting our ability to sleep comfortably at night or to safely walk along the shared drive/ROW on a windy day. Our chalet will potentially be squeezed into a potential wind-tunnel.

We note the words of Mr D. Lammont, the building inspector, who refused the appeal to 39 OFR's first scheme of semi-detached dwellings some five years ago: "THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD INTRODUCE A SUBSTANTIAL 2-STOREY ELEMENT IN RELATIVELY CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE MODEST GARDENS OF THE DWELLINGS TO THE REAR WHICH FRONT THE MEADWAY. A DOMINANT & INTRUSIVE FEATURE WHICH WOULD BE HARMFUL TO THE RELATIVELY OPEN ASPECT FROM THE REAR WINDOWS & GARDENS OF THE NEIGHBOURING GARDENS IN THE

MEADWAY." Words and sentiment that, in hindsight, could be relevant to the current scheme at 43 Old Fort Road.

So, of the four chalets in our row in 2006, ours is the sole remainer at 41. If the current scheme at 43 proceeds, our home will look, and feel, over-powered by wood-clad, slab-sided modernity that, some would say, lacks character or architectural merit and breaks the mold of the character and heritage of Shoreham Beach: modest, enjoying space and light, attractive and unpretentious. But the over-bearing nature of modern high-rise design is something our Council might be heeded to reserve for the regeneration of the wharves along the Adur river down to the Lighthouse but could so easily take a different view when considering tight, eclectic, neighbourhoods such as Shoreham Beach.

We acknowledge the concerns laid out by our near-neighbours, Philip Navier [39 The Meadway & Jo & Steve Edmonds at 37 who are understandably concerned about the height, mass and proximity of 43's new scheme and whose future owner-occupiers, in the fullness of time, may wish erect small conservatories, or similar, to the rear of their dwellings whose footprint already appears to encroach even further into the rear garden that abutts 39 The Meadway.

We hold to the notion that the most ideal scheme for 43 OFR is a modern version of a low-pitch, detached chalet bungalow, replacing what has gone before; like for like and not another flat-roofed "block-house" design that many beach residents have been concerned about in the past.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Tony Wallington & Mrs Sandra Goldfinch