Burke, Sara

From: RT1
Sent: 07 May 2021 07:56
To: East 2
Subject: FW: 66 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5HA - Application Number: AWDM/1085/20; Planning Inspectorate number: APP/Y3805/W/21/3270585

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FAO Sarah

From: [redacted]
Sent: 06 May 2021 21:09
To: RT1 <RT1@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: 66 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5HA - Application Number: AWDM/1085/20; Planning Inspectorate number: APP/Y3805/W/21/3270585

Thank you for your letter dated 26/4/21, which I received on 30/4/21. I note the appeal start date is 15/4/21. I welcome the invitation to comment.

I would ask that the committee's determination: "The proposal, by reason of its excessive scale and massing, would be out of keeping and detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding built environment therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan" be upheld.

I also ask, what are the grounds of the appeal please?

I made written representations in advance of and oral representations to the 8/2/21 Adur Planning Committee meeting. I understand that these will be made available to you. You will see from the recording of the meeting that committee members thoroughly discussed this application and expressed concerns with the "bulk" of the proposed dwelling. This agenda item starts at 8 minutes 20 seconds into the recording of the 8/2/21 committee meeting, with a presentation by a member of the planning advisory staff. The representations start at 34 minutes 15 seconds and the discussion by committee members at approximately 54 minutes. You will note the measured consideration given and concerns expressed by all committee members who engaged on the subject matter. One example (at 32 minutes and 33 seconds) is Councillor Cowan wrestling with the "bulk" of the proposal and preventing the south side, beachfront houses becoming "blocky" (in essence, if approved, the size of such a house contributing to the appearance of a terrace, alongside similar existing and future properties).

There is no objection on my part to replacing the existing building, it is the proposed overdevelopment (size of the footprint) that is of concern.

John Thompson

Virus-free. www.avg.com



Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



Please consider the environment before printing this email