

Architect's Statement - s73 Application

This application seeks approval to a number of non-material changes to the approved design, as is allowed by a s73 application, this is not a retrospective application. None of the proposed changes within the application affects in any way the height of the building, which remains as approved at circa 10.0 m high. Indeed, some of the design changes for which approval is applied for are a positive improvement over the original design, i.e. the removal of the glazed link between No 27 and No 25 which the client also owns and intends to keep in her ownership.

There has been a lot of negative opinion and incorrect assumptions stated about the building, which cannot be substantiated, these unfortunately have gone viral in the local and wider community, Facebook groups and local press. Some of these views are based on looking at a building under construction, rather than the finished house. Once the roof is tiled in the approved slate and the architectural detailing completed the building will not seem so dominant, indeed some may love it, at the moment it's a shell.

There has been a well-documented highly vitriolic campaign by certain individuals to stop this private development by any means possible and I would hope that ADC will assess this s73 application objectively.

As far as I can see none of the objectors have an issue with the s73 changes, other than some ill-founded subjective criticism and personal vitriol aimed at IBA and the contractor. What seems to concern the thrust of the rep letters is that they believe, as they have been told, that the building has been constructed to the wrong height, this is incorrect.

The decision letter stated that the FFL must be set no lower than 4.41 AOD and the officer's report states that the building is circa 10 m high, by scaling from the pdf plans submitted, this indicates that the eventual height would be circa 14.41 AOD, currently I expect the final ridge height to be circa 14.38. As the architect, I can confirm that the building has been constructed in line with the approved floor plans and elevations. Therefore, the final height is as approved on the elevation drawings.

Given the location of the site a ridge height of 10 m above ground level is not excessive and when viewed from the beach it will only be 8.6 m from the top of the shingle beach to the ridge. Indeed, the building can only really be viewed from the beach as the land to the north is private and it cannot be seen directly from Central Drive. Currently on the north side the site has temporary reduced site levels, which give a misleading indication of the height.

The seafront from Pagham to Ferring has a varied range of architectural styles of varying heights and designs, indeed just down the road from the site we have 2 large 3 storey sea front blocks of flats, this house is nothing out of the ordinary, there are many large detached houses along the coastal strip. Indeed, given the house's location behind the shingle bank at a lower level, it will sit comfortably on the beach frontage.

The new property will not, due to the approved height, have an adverse effect on any other adjacent property to the rear or the side. The client owns No 25 and will be using both houses as part of her retirement plan, [REDACTED] No 25 will be used to accommodate her carers.

Following consideration of this s73 application my client hopes that ADC planning officers can be both brave and bold in approving the amendments to the design, and not be influenced by the negative opinion openly expressed in some of the third party and personally addressed letters.

Finally, this house when finished will be of a high quality architectural design, which should be considered an improvement and a stunning landmark statement to the EBE beach sea front.

Ivon Blumer Architects Ltd, 09/08/2021