

Principal Planning Officer,
Simon Davies
Planning Department,
Directorate of Place,
[Arun District Council](#)

Dear Simon

12th May 2020

After studying Mr Edwards design review opinions in his document of the 29th April 2020 there seem to be some contradicting and misleading aspects.

Our initial plans issued to Mr Edwards were acknowledged by him to have considered pre application advice. Quoting reduced height and quantum, continuity of floor levels and horizontal banding of neighbouring buildings, giving a more sensitive and harmonious connection to Waterloo court.

Even the visual impact was included in these comments positively. This was then bolstered further by our resubmitted plans and subsequent comments where very positive points are raised again below.

Mr Edwards compliments the more spacious accommodation, the more articulate elevations and traditional forms and materials along with reduced height and increased permeable ground floor areas.

Mr Edwards rightly notes the blank facades which can be remedied with some more detail and window apertures. We are more than happy to work with Arun District Council and potentially enhance the building even more should you feel it necessary.

Fire safety will be paramount, however building control are satisfied with this design as per their consultee comments regarding the application.

There have always been significant height variations between buildings in Waterloo square, these can clearly be seen on the Design and access document, the covering page old photograph showing the juncture with Waterloo court is good example of this.



Note 4, states quite clearly that our current plans do relate to neighbouring buildings, they frame a view of the Pier (Heritage asset) and further more do retain a sense of enclosure around the corner of Waterloo square and the Esplanade.

Surprisingly in point 10, this is contradicted. In fact if you take a good look from the most Northerly end of Waterloo square due south there are no gaps or roads visible on either side ,they all become one frame or as better described "continuous terrace".

Regarding points 5&6, as previously explained there have always been gaps and irregularities around Waterloo square, the wider view will be enhanced and integration will be achieved. The pier as an heritage asset is undeniable but from the East and West elevations it's architectural merit very questionable.



Mr Edwards quote of 50% extra height is completely inaccurate and misleading, when studied in our Design and access statement document it is clearly the

equivalent of under one full story higher than Cavendish house and slightly over one storey higher than Waterloo Court (please see points 6.9 6.8 in the Design and Access statement).

It should be noted that the height and mass of the current amended proposals have been significantly reduced following recommendations from Arun District Council.

Following analysis of the existing buildings on the adjoining waterfront it can clearly be seen that our site forms the last corner of a taller quarter framing Waterloo Square.

Buildings on the opposite side of the square continuing back further towards the Steyne Gardens and beyond are noticeably lower with the exception of buildings that historically grew taller as they fronted the esplanade.

Additionally when viewed in a wider context, other existing buildings overlooking the esplanade rise to 6-7 stories.

Our proposals complete this visually taller segment while offering a new quality to the area respecting the conservation area. The photo below illustrates our site sitting in the taller quarter. There is a clear separation over Waterloo Square gardens to the lower quarter.



Since 2017 following the DSE Advise note under “Architectural and conservation approach” it was stated that:

*“We are sure it would be possible to make a case for a **five** or **six** storey building on conservation and townscape grounds for this site”*

and

*“We do **not** see any need for this development to **step-up** from the lower buildings in Waterloo Square. It could be expressed as a **single height** which would make for a*

*more rational building. In this regard **we disagree** with the Conservation/Design Officer response”*

This again contradicts other advice supplied to our Design Team and is yet another person's personal view point.

Our proposals are 5 storey with a set-back reduced depth 6th storey which will be hidden when viewed from street level.

Separating the mass into two separate buildings achieves a street Cafe vibe that is important and will help regenerate the Norfolk street area in line with the Bognor Regis neighbourhood Development plan "Old Town Restaurant & Cultural Quarter" moving forward this will encourage people to explore the quaint parts of our town.

These details and facts **MUST** be noted and the following photos studied, as it is clear there are some very questionable "assets" within the immediate conservation area.



The description of "framing" is over exaggerated in the context of Waterloo square in the design review document.



We must look forward positively, our level site in this prime location for nearly four years is stagnating regeneration, complementing absolutely nothing.

We feel we have reacted sympathetically and taken on board numerous “design, heritage and conservation” comments which we feel we have proactively reacted to in our current proposals.

I am sure you can understand our frustration but welcome the positive comments regarding the amended scheme now and are keen to provide a building of quality that sits well within the site context and which also improves the area for years to come.