From: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Sent: 25 February 2022 16:00
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
Subject: Comments for Planning Application AWDM/2007/21

Flag Status: Flagged

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 25/02/2022 4:00 PM from Ms Sam Cole.

Application Summary

Address:	51 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RL
Proposal:	Demolition of existing chalet bungalow and construction of a pair of semi detached 3 storey, 3 bedroom houses (including lower ground floor below existing ground level) (Amended plans received showing set back to first floor of front elevation)
Case Officer:	Hannah Barker

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Ms Sam Cole
Address:	45 The Meadway, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5RN

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Ref: AWDM/2007/21 Amended plans for 51 Old Fort Road BN43 5RL I wish to make a formal objection to the amended planning application for the above property.

Although revised plans have been submitted it appears that none of the key criteria, as requested by the recent planning committee meeting (7th February), have not been addressed. Councillor Edwards had concerns about the forward projection and clearly asked and I quote 'For the matter to be deferred to see whether further discussion can be done to accommodate everyone's concerns that have been raised this evening' - this included the forward projection. While the first floor has been moved back the single-story projection is unchanged and therefore clearly fails to fulfil this specific request. Also, the first floor has a huge overhanging balcony added which is now the same projection as the single-story and therefore completely negates the first-floor change - again, this totally misses the brief.

Also discussed by the councillors was not only the forward projection but the side elevation and the very limited width and dimension of the plot in question. No attempt has been made to address the profile and the height remains unchanged.

It is fundamentally too large for the plot and shifting the top section back does not solve the underlying problem as it still has the same profile and projection. No amount of realigning without reducing the overall size/mass of this vast house will ever make it fit such a small plot.

It is imperative that all plans should abide by the Adur Planning Policy and attempts to ignore or avoid this must surely raise questions of the impartiality of the process. I refer to Policy 15 of the Adur Planning Policy which clearly states and covers the contentious issues - "Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should: - Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development; Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space."

In conclusion these current plans fail to address the forward projection, depth of plot, side elevation and limited width and dimensions of the plot.

Samantha Cole, 45 The Meadway, BN43 5RN

Kind regards